THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Rev. D. R. Davies, whose previous books have been appreciatively reviewed in this magazine, has a subject in *Divine Judgment in Human History*[1] which is meat and drink to a neo-Calvinist like himself. If he has read Professor Joad's Introduction to his republished book of wordy warfare with Mr. Arnold Lunn he will be greatly encouraged. For Professor Joad says that one conclusion that has been forced on him by history is that the heart of man is desperately wicked. That is the sombre fact which looms in the background of this new book.

Perhaps we may begin these notes on it at the end. These are the concluding words of the book: '"Repent"—there must be the burden of the Christian message to this age, which is drinking the bitterest waters of all historical eras. In a day when the Judgment of God has melted into burning lava and is pouring through the ruins of man's proudest achievements, let the prophetic trumpet-call of repentance pierce the tormented soul of man, so that men, here and now, may lay hold of the redemption done, once and forever, by God in Christ.' How does Mr. Davies reach this conclusion?

His book (which is the latest in the 'Christian News-Letter Books' series) has three chapters—'Judgment as Process,' 'The Mechanics of Judgment,' and 'Gospel and Judgment,' and the first chapter is largely occupied in explaining what Judgment is. Mr. Davies sees Marxism and Neo-Calvinism as the two triumphant systems of thought to-day. And they are at one in this, that they both see Judgment, not as an accident or sporadic or, as it were, from the outside, but, as a process, a constant process, in historic development. It is not an event or a verdict or a descent into history of the transcendent or alien to history, but rather a process, a fruition, an emergence into history of the subterranean, a submarine breaking surface not an aeroplane swooping down.

People speak of the events of the present time as Judgment. But they are merely the final phase as the birth of an organism is the conclusion of the process of procreation. They are simply the stage at which a continuous, objective process becomes perceptible to the dull-witted, fatty-hearted natural man. But the process reaches far back. It has been going on all the time unperceived. The whole of history is one long, persistent process of Divine Judgment.

Why? Because human nature is essentially self-destructive. History demonstrates the futility of man. It is the process by which the creative capacity in man becomes self-destructive. Men will not see this. Pride scales the eyes and blunts the moral understanding. But you can see the process at work in special cases. The French Revolution was the final dissipation of the Feudal illusion. Our Armageddon is the dissipation of the Capitalist illusion. But the real significance of these successive single judgments is, says Mr. Davies (in a phrase that can only be explained by the context of his analysis) that history itself is an impossible experiment. Whatever originates from the will of man remains self-destructive.

Every 'ism,' every system, goes the same way. In history man sees the futility of single, particular societies only. But Final Judgment, about which the New Testament has no doubt, will be the realization by man of the futility of history itself. When that realization comes—that history, *i.e.* trying to live in defiance of God's will, is a mug's game—history will dissolve. The conclusion of this part of the book is, in one of Mr. Davies' elusive sentences, that Judgment is the essence of history.

The second part explains how the process works—'The Mechanics of Judgment.' What is the mechanism by which the inherent principle of self-destructiveness comes to concrete reality? How does Judgment become visible to the world? What are the methods by which history develops the radical contradiction of egoistic will? All civilizations rise and fall and end in nothingness. And this is due to what Dr. Arnold Toynbee calls 'inner discord.' External attack never destroys

[1] Sheldon Press; 1s. 6d. net.

civilizations. Successful external attack is simply the last stage in a process of internal corruption and disintegration. The barbarian invasions, to take an instance, accumulated on Rome in her decay, of which they were the consequence.

And we can detect the stage at which a civilization has arrived by certain outward signs. An advancing civilization has two characteristics, productive power, growth of economic resources (with an accompanying development in culture) *and* definite moral evils, such as injustice, cruelty and exploitation. The golden era of our Capitalist society constituted also its most immoral, inhuman phase. Its golden prosperity as a system was, at the same time, the iron oppression and exploitation of the weak and defenceless masses. On the other hand, in its decline a civilization becomes less cruel and unjust than in its advance. Our Capitalist society is declining. Signs of this are found in unemployment, new poverty and destruction of consumer and capital wealth. But in its decline Capitalist society is exercised by a much more sensitive social conscience. The vast development of social services is evidence of that.

But the improved morality does not preserve Capitalist society from decay. *In fact, it intensifies it.* In history we see slave society passing into Feudalism, and Feudalism passing into Capitalism. Into what will Capitalism pass? Socialism? Is that the next stage? If so, Socialism will be subject to the same process of judgment that is inherent in human history. Man will never find social forms that will last in which to exist independently of the will of God.

This leads us naturally to the last stage of the argument—the Gospel and Judgment. The gospel is good news, but only if first of all it is bad news. Men will realize what the gospel signifies only when they become convinced of their powerlessness to save themselves. So long as a man nourishes the delusive hope that he can solve his own problem, the promise that Christ can and will solve that problem will not greatly interest him. How can contemporary man be brought to face this? To face the reality of his own nature? That, says Mr. DAVIES, is our problem. It is in this context that Gospel and Judgment are organically related. Hence the gospel is, first of all, the interpretation of history as Judgment.

Prophetic interpretation of events is the Church's greatest obligation to the Kingdom of God in every historic situation, but especially in the present. And the prophetic word for our day is that the present is Judgment. Until we see that we shall not see any need of redemption. We shall be satisfied with social analysis and remedies. Broadly speaking, it may be said that the collapse of Europe is being attributed by the secular mind to a failure of social mechanism. Correct the mechanism and humanity will be able to resume its march on and up. Such an attitude will dissipate the sense of disturbance and the self-questioning by which men and women are being visited.

But it is the duty of the Church to say something quite different—that the grim events of our day are evidence, not of a failure of social mechanism but of a radical corruption and impotence of the human will. They are another proof of the hopelessness of man's attempt to be independent of God. This war is the latest phase in the continuity of the Divine Judgment of history. This is the first and the most momentous message which the Church must proclaim to our world to-day. Judgment, then Redemption. Not that the Church should be indifferent to the vast problem of social renewal. It must be deeply concerned with that. But the Church must (while it propagates and supports a new idealist order) at the same time show its inadequacy.

Judgment and Redemption—and the bridge between them is Repentance. Repentance means two things, first to realize the futility of trying to be independent of God, and second, the resolve to abandon that independence for submission to God's will. So the great burden of preaching in an era of judgment must be the cry of repentance. This will not be popular preaching. In Dean Inge's words, there will never be a queue at the strait gate. Mr. DAVIES has severe things to say about the 'secular Left' to whom the way of thinking in this book is anathema, and, rather surprisingly, he quotes Mr. Churchill against them: 'There never was a time when the hope of immortality and the disdain of earthly power and achievement were more necessary for the safety of the children of men.' And these words lead him to the final message which we have quoted and which contains his deepest thought about our time and its need.

Social Witness and Evangelism[1] is the title of the Beckly Lecture for 1943 by Dr. William TEMPLE, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Lecture is based on the conviction that in this period of history social witness is an indispensable instru-

[1] Epworth Press; paper covers 1s. 6d., cloth boards 2s. 6d.

ment of Christian Evangelism. On the other hand, as one would expect the lecturer to say, to proclaim the divine law for society is a primary obligation resting upon the Christian Church even though no evangelism should follow.

The burden of the Lecture, however, is that while the gospel impels us to the task of social witness, of a Christian approach to questions of social justice, our social witness leads us and all who hear us back to the gospel, to a renewed belief in the need for individual conversion and dedication.

Or, as it is otherwise put, the social witness of the Church is a consequence of the gospel for those who already believe it, because the gospel impels them to do all they can to remedy injustice, to alleviate distress, to create fellowship, and to promote the development of fully matured persons in fellowship. At the same time, the social witness of the Church is a preparation for the gospel, because the words which must be used derive their meaning in the minds of the hearers from experience of home and community.

Should that experience be unfortunate the appeal of the gospel may still be felt, if by the force of contrast. But Dr. TEMPLE virtually dismisses this consideration, perhaps in his zeal for social witness as a primary obligation of the Church: 'If a child has grown up in a home tyrannized over by a brutal and drunken father, the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God may be horrible and repellent to him, and the opening words of the Lord's Prayer have no appeal. If there is no experience of common life where each feels that he is both needed and welcome and also that he carries some responsibility for the welfare of the whole, it is far harder to attach real meaning to the fellowship of the Church or the Communion of Saints.'

Of course we must allow that the social and economic structure is the most potent of all educational forces in the formation of character, and that it is a mighty aid to the Christian preacher if family, school, and community are preparing the soil for the seed of the gospel. Accordingly, he should seek so far as possible to have the social order as his ally and not his antagonist. But that does not mean, and we are sure Dr. TEMPLE would not have it mean, that his personal witness should not have free course even under present social conditions, however unchristian.

In urging upon the Church its obligation of social witness the Lecturer deals specially with an 'arena of activity' which, apart from the new organizations set on foot during the war in preparation for national service, the State has as yet left practically untouched: namely, the boys and girls in their later 'teens.' He would specially apply to them the principle embodied in the formula which he himself offered to the Minister of Education, and which the Minister of Education used in introducing the Bill of 1918: 'Every citizen until the age of eighteen should be regarded as primarily a subject of education, not primarily a factor in industry.' And he would urge that while the Church should work with all who share the great educational aim of developing persons in community, it should never conceal its own ultimate aim—which is its evangelic aim—of creating a true fellowship with God in Christ as the basis and foundation of a true fellowship of persons one with another.

In an appendix to the Lecture some problems in the training of adolescents are discussed, and a glowing tribute paid to the work of the Oxford and Bermondsey Mission—now Club—under Dr. Stansfield.

A second appendix contains some suggestions with regard to the approach to the task of evangelism. The essential task, which is the proclamation of the unchanging gospel, does not vary, but in our modern world we need often to find the 'eye' into which the 'hook' of the gospel can fit. We must reckon, in particular, with a frame of mind due to the undue prominence of the physical sciences in our recent thinking and education.

One feature of it is the tendency to suppose that only what can be measured or weighed is really knowable or even apprehensible. Another is the 'spectator attitude' to life, which makes religion a mere matter of personal opinion or feeling, and not the total self-committal of a man to God. 'Knowledge *about* God is valuable in its place; but knowledge *of* God alone has saving power.'

It would be well, if it were possible, to arrive at an agreed definition of the word 'Christian,' so that we might know more definitely the limits within which it would be justly applicable. It ought surely, at the least, to denote a realm of thought and life in which Jesus Christ holds the supreme place and is accepted as the final authority.

These reflections are prompted by the appearance of an able book which, while claiming to be

Christian, does not seem to conform to that definition. Its title is *The Christian Philosophy of History*, by Professor Shirley Jackson CASE.[1]

Anything in the shape of a special revelation is waived aside. 'The very idea of revelation is a seductive concept apt to prove misleading unless viewed in the light of history. . . . Whatever the medium of communication may be, the student of history knows that revelation is to be accredited only as the sincere conviction of the religious person who sponsors the allegedly revealed truth.' In accordance with this 'The historian knows that the Bible is an incidental outgrowth of the Hebrew and Christian religions over a thousand-year period. . . . To treat the Bible as though it were the one authentic deposit of religion in its final form—a body of revelation once for all delivered to the saints—is to substitute a part for the whole and to mistake one crop of fruit for the generative energy that reproduces the harvest in successive seasons.' By no single word does the writer acknowledge that Jesus Christ must for ever hold a unique place in the religion which is called by His name.

In his opening chapters a sketch is given of the various views of history which at different times have held the field. There was first of all the 'Providential View of History,' which was dominant in Hebrew and early Christian thought. In the Church it received its classical expression in Augustine's 'City of God.' This view emphasizes the divine government. God actively rules in the affairs of men, working out His eternal purpose, supporting the good and overruling the evil, making even the wrath of man to praise Him.

There succeeded to this in modern times what may be called the 'Human View of History.' 'Men began to be more definitely conscious of their own responsibility for the making of history. Human initiative demanded, and received, an increasing measure of recognition in the political, economic, and intellectual spheres. . . . Gradually emphasis shifted from the decrees of God to the activities of men in moulding the course of history.' Under this view history is less interested in justifying the ways of God to man than in tracing the process of the human struggle godward. The historian's task is to sift testimony, to search for facts, to discover causes, and to discern, so far as may be, the general trend in human affairs. In connexion with this last element in the historian's task the problem of progress has to be faced. Is the movement upward? Is it purposeful? So long as the hand of God was believed to be on the helm these questions could be answered with a confident affirmative. But if the issue depended on man's activity the answer might be in doubt. Modern man's faith, however, in his own destiny and in his power to control events generated a confident optimism which took for granted that the general trend of world affairs was onward and upward to some glorious consummation.

[1] University of Chicago Press; 12s. net.

This optimism, so long regnant, has not been unchallenged. Associated with the names of Kierkegaard and later Karl Barth there has been a 'revival of historical dualism' according to which 'the whole world is one vast arena of embattled opposites, and its ultimate nature is incapable of being understood by the unifying hypothesis of progressive historical development.' It is assumed that this 'cult of crisis' is the natural result of the convulsions through which the world is now passing, and may be expected to fade away when quieter times return. But is it so certain that the trend of world affairs can be seen more clearly from the armchair than from the battlefield? Surely they who have passed through earthquake and fire and flood, or have encountered storms and seen God's wonders in the deep, have more adequate conceptions of the elemental powers of Nature than those others who have lived sheltered lives. Even so, it may be argued, they who have lived amid wars and revolutions and seen the surging of human passions are better able to estimate the terrific forces at work in human history than others who have known only the piping days of peace.

It cannot be said that Barth and the theology of crisis are here dealt with in an understanding and sympathetic way. 'The result of the Barthian movement has been a decline of interest in the human processes of history. . . . True men of God do not rise up to action but repose in despair of their own powers and wait for God to bring an end to time and usher in eternity.' This is frankly a travesty, but it is in line with the ignorant but persistent idea that Calvinism is another name for fatalism. Who has been a more determined and vigorous opponent of Hitlerism than Karl Barth? Has he for a single moment 'reposed in despair'? And, to go further back, who have fought more valiantly against all tyranny and in defence of civil and religious liberty than the Calvinists of Scotland and the Netherlands, the Puritans of England and America? Their faith in the overruling Providence of God never benumbed their human activity but only reinforced it.

What, in fine, are we offered as the true Christian Philosophy of History? The answer is, pure American activism. The revelation of God in Christ being silently ignored, we are left with the evolutionary process as our guide and with man as the only active agent in controlling that process. The whole responsibility is laid on man. Even 'the perpetuation of Christianity, or of religion by whatever name it may be called, is a human responsibility.' It might be supposed that God is quite left out of the picture, but that is not so. For science reveals a world which stirs us to 'awesome reverence,' a world of inexorable law and, above all, of creative energy. These are a revelation of God. 'The urge to produce and the elemental stuff with which we work are a more ultimate reality the apprehension of which constitutes our deepest knowledge of God.' For such a God, thus dimly known, mankind is privileged, or doomed, to toil, 'with ample days ahead for new experiences and experiments in the making of history,' 'fortunate, indeed, that we have eons of time for the accomplishment of this gigantic task.'

Most barren and unsatisfying faith! It offers to toiling humanity a God who does not really help, and who in all their afflictions is *not* afflicted; a God who throws the whole responsibility on to man's shoulders, who stands by and says 'It's up to you. Here is the field, here are the rules. Now to the utmost of your ability play the game.' This is but small comfort to poor humans toiling in sweat and blood, suffering and dying with so little light on the meaning and purpose of it all. It is safe to say that for one who would feel inspired by this creed to higher hope and new activity a thousand would feel their hope quenched and their energies benumbed.

Cults of To-day.

VI. Pseudo-Oriental Mysticism.

By Professor Godfrey E. Phillips, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

In a bookshop porch I saw an Air Force man's eye fall on a book on Indian Yoga, and heard him say to his wife with bated breath, 'Did I tell you what —— told me about Yoga?' What —— told him I do not know; perhaps something about levitation or how a yogi could twitch his ears, but the bated breath is our present concern. There is more than the usual tendency just now to be fascinated by the occult, particularly if it originates in the eastern hemisphere. In itself it is harmless enough, like our fondness for the ghost-story, especially of the creepy sort; we enjoy being mystified, and feeling our flesh creep. But in two ways it is thoroughly undesirable; as a symptom of loss of more serious faith, the vacuum in the mind being filled up by queer unexamined notions from many sources. The other is that false ideas about the East are being spread abroad which take the place of true solidly-based respect on which sound world-relationships can be built up. Only a few years ago the conventional Chinese shown on the films was mysterious, usually also cunningly wicked, but we have banished him in favour of truer portraits of modern Chinese, our allies in a world-struggle for liberty. We are likely to foster better relations with India if we show less readiness to welcome fake mysteries, and expect our Indian friends to be as rational as ourselves. We can do this without denying that, East or West alike, there are psychic and physical phenomena which very few people understand, and which the ordinary wholesome man would be wise to leave alone. Let us hope that in the next few years the lay figure of 'The Mystic Oriental' may go to Limbo with the dreaded Mr. Wu of the former screen.

We have altogether overdone the difference—whatever it may be—between the peoples living in one part or another of this small world of ours. A brilliant Indian after sharing in a seminar on Race Relations in Yale University wrote a book which deserves to be more widely read, which flatly denies that there is any real difference between Eastern and Western peoples, and shows that the real factors governing the growth of civilizations cannot be differentiated as occidental or oriental. (*East versus West*: A Denial of Contrast, by P. Kodanda Rau. Allen & Unwin, London, 1939.) He proves that much mischief has crept into political and social relationships from these erroneous ideas about the 'Oriental.' What is more, in a foreword to the book the best known Indian philosopher, Sir S. Radhakrishnan, who certainly *does* know about Yoga and the

profundities of Indian thought, expresses his own faith ' that human nature is everywhere the same and has developed in different ways, determined by the factors of geography and history.'

Once that is realized, we shall hear less about many things now offered as proof of something specially supernatural about ' the East.' I talked once with an Indian conjuror of more than usual merit. No, he did not perform ' the rope trick,' but he did several other things which would take too much space to describe, exactly of the kind which impress the simple-minded as unaccountable by human agency. In fact ' This not man's work ' was our Indian ayah's exclamation when he apparently produced twelve snakes out of nothing. But he had been a performer at Maskelyne and Levant's, the home of professional illusionism, where Maskelyne proved that he could do by the methods of the conjuror anything which was in those days adduced by Mesdames Blavatsky and Besant as evidence of powers coming from another sphere.

Those stories about some curse by a ' holy man ' coming to roost in a family after several generations have nothing ' eastern ' or ' mystical ' about them. The notion of the dreadful efficacy of an uttered curse is primitive, and we only think it eastern because most of our countrymen outgrew it so thoroughly as to forget that once we all held it and trembled. The same is true of the supposed materializing and vanishing again of spirits ; these are a carry-over from animism, the religion of all races at a particular primitive stage of culture. There is nothing ridiculous in these things in themselves ; they were stepping-stones and served their purpose in their time, witness the Bible itself amongst other ancient literature. But there is a flavour of the ridiculous about twentieth-century people going back to them as something peculiarly profound and ' oriental.'

More intellectually respectable, and deserving of investigation by experts in psychic research (not by most of us amateurs) are the messages supposed to be telepathically received, whether direct or through media, from spirits in the unseen. They have no necessary connection with religion, are no more frequent in one part of the world than another, interest Americans quite as much as Indians, and are *not* mystical unless that word is taken to mean simply ' mysterious,' which is a weakening and lowering of its proper sense. Yet a not inconsiderable number of people esteem discourse on such matters as more profound than what they hear in church on Sundays, and in the long run find the act of worship too simple and elementary for them to engage in. It is all as silly as it is sad in its results. This series of articles has already shown how some modern fads are definite revivals of Gnostic heresies from the second and third centuries. The Church knew what it was about when it firmly rejected them all, for while some looked harmless, their results proved them to be essentially Fifth Column activity, loosening allegiance to God revealed in Christ, which is precisely what is observable to-day. Playing upon the childish pleasure of knowing a ' secret ' which one's playmates do not share, they encourage an unwarranted feeling of intellectual superiority inimical to faith and love. It would do modern Gnostics good to read Clement of Alexandria's treatment of the Greek mysteries. He certainly had no prejudice against mysteries as such ; he must have been initiated into them to be able to write as he did, and some of his most beautiful writing is in their language. But he had two fundamental charges to bring against them. They had associations, from which they could not be disentangled, with polytheism, drunkenness, obscenity and sexual immorality, concerning which Christians who felt attracted must be warned in scorching words. But even if this had not been so, they would have been a fraud, for life's supreme secret knowledge which they professed to impart came only from the revelation of the Son of God. To His initiates came the illumination which they could never have discovered for themselves, the ultimate divine communication of light and life. These occult oriental ceremonies were precursors, first drafts, or caricatures of what was to come, namely the true mysteries of Christian worship ; but as alternatives to it they were merely pernicious. Only in Christ are life's final secrets really unveiled.

This recalls to us that mysteries were so familiar to the world of the New Testament that its language is frequently coloured by them, so much so that not many years back it was an intellectual fashion to treat Christianity as largely borrowed from them. But in the New Testament ' mysteries ' always concern divine knowledge which man could never have discovered for himself but which by divine grace is now made available to those who fulfil the conditions for receiving it. Hence mysticism in so far as it is Christian must be the immediate realization of that knowledge so communicated. If mysticism is the immediate perception of reality, Christian mysticism is that same perception with a vast plus, namely a pre-supposition about what that reality is ; it is coloured by previous knowledge of the whole ' history of redemption ' of which the Bible is the literary deposit. The Godhead of whom the *Christian* mystic has direct intuition can never be other than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, even in the supreme moment of the saint's undifferentiated feeling. We make bold to disagree

with those critics of Catholic mysticism (*e.g.* W. Herrmann in his *Verkehr*) who assume that one must base one's faith *either* upon redemptive history *or* upon mystical experience which is not distinctively Christian. The simple facts of the saints' lives prove that there can be experience which is truly mystical and truly Christian, because its distinctive tincture is due to objective Christian history. We must not be led aside at this point into further pursuit of the vital theme of what is true Christian mysticism; enough has been said to set it as a background to the 'pseudo-oriental mysticism' which is our present concern. We turn back to a curious feature of the latter which is specially common, namely a reverence for the abstract and impersonal. Most British people suppose it more intellectual to say 'Reality' or 'Being' than to say 'God.' It sounds more philosophical to say it in Greek, τὸ ὄν; but somehow the deeps of wisdom are held to be plumbed by those who say in solemn tones the Sanskrit word 'Brăhmă.' In passing we note that St. Paul was not so overawed by superior non-Christian wisdom when he stood at the heart of it on Mars Hill and said 'The times of this ignorance God winked at.' There is a certain amount of bluff in the prevalent assumption that the abstract term, preferably in some other language than English, contains more wisdom than the concrete or personal one.

The erroneous root of this notion has often been pointed out. Because in our common experience persons are just men, women, and children who have obvious limitations and faults, we take those limitations and faults to be of the essence of personality. We forget the instances in which those limitations are transcended, which prove that they are not essential to it. So we confusedly think of bodies, and of personality as cut up as it were into six-foot lengths, and hesitate to ascribe it to God, avoiding personal terms as anthropomorphic. It is not surprising that we should be so confused, and there are plenty of books on Christian theism to help clear the confusion away. What is really odd is that those so confused should feel themselves intellectually superior to those who see that personality is not limited to our faulty human versions of it, but rather is the highest category we can find in our language for God's perfections.

There is a notable example of the assumption that the abstract is superior to the concrete in the treatment of mysticism in Mr. Aldous Huxley's remarkable book *Grey Eminence*. In the opening chapter he describes Father Joseph's meditation on the sufferings of Christ, with a degree of imaginative insight astonishing in view of what comes later. Mr. Huxley was 'near to the kingdom' when he wrote that chapter. But in his third chapter he traces one stream of mysticism in the Catholic Church, from Hinduism and Neo-Platonism through Plotinus, Augustine, pseudo-Dionysius, and the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, which he holds to be true and real mysticism. (Incidentally, some stepping-stones in this history are not as firm as Mr. Huxley's treatment would suggest, though the present writer has for many years believed, on internal evidence, in the existence of some connection between Hinduism, neo-Platonism, and certain phases of early Christian mysticism. Also, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, in spite of its fondness for language more suited to Neo-Platonism, does not really illustrate Mr. Huxley's theme, for it plainly presupposes Christian history even when it says 'Lift up thine heart to God with a blind stirring of love; and mean himself and none of his goods.' But at the moment this is not our chief concern.) The later mysticism which made the facts of Christian history more prominent, by such exercises as meditation on the passion of Christ, he characterizes either as not true mysticism at all, or as mysticism at lower stages, to be transcended in those 'higher' stages in which the soul is united to 'the undifferentiated Godhead.' The mysticism of the Vedanta is the higher mysticism, when it says 'That art thou,' intending the 'thou' to lose utterly its individual existence, and 'That' to be described only in negatives. Christian mysticism is lower mysticism when it says 'To me to live is Christ,' for the term 'Christ' carries a whole story with it, and the 'me' is neither annihilated nor merged but made one by perfect union of wills. But why 'higher' and 'lower'? Why is the conception of the ultimate Reality as a negative abstraction, 'That,' superior to the conception of the ultimate Reality as the Love manifested in the death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross? Anyone may deny that this Love is the final Reality, but he has not the right to say that a quality-less 'That' is superior to this Love. No one would say it if his sense of values had not been warped by the notion that abstractions are superior to concretions, or that what starts in the Upanishads must necessarily be more profound than what starts in the Gospels. That even Mr. Huxley is not immune from such confusion is apparent from one startling passage. In describing how his Friar Joseph fell into the temptation of joining in doubtful political activities, he quotes the following impassioned line from his poetry—'To quench fires of my ardour, I must drown me in a sea of blood.' Friar Joseph was ready, Mr. Huxley says, to have his zeal for a crusade extinguished by a sea of other people's blood, and that may have been because the Friar 'spent half a

lifetime brooding upon the torture and death of a man-god, by comparison with whose sufferings those of ordinary human beings are so infinitesimal as to be practically negligible.' Surely this is the first time it has been suggested that meditation on the sufferings of Christ can lead to the shedding of *other people's* blood, and it ought to be the last. To such fantastic errors leads the denial to the final Reality of personality and of all qualities, and the assumption that Hindu or Buddhist philosophy is profounder than Christian philosophy.

Friar Joseph fell into temptation, in spite of his earlier mysticism, and Mr. Huxley's brilliant exposition shows clearly how, quite apart from this unnecessary passage. If his power-politics, which was the normal type of politics of his day, was shot through here and there by compassion and readiness for personal suffering for others' good, as the book quite honestly depicts, that must be ascribed to his religion, which included a mystical participation in the sufferings of his Lord. What would this power-politician, cleverer than Richelieu, have been without his personal self-denial? Or suppose he had reached the heights of mysticism according to the Upanishads and according to Mr. Huxley, and perceived intuitively the identity of his own being with that of the Absolute concerning which one can only say 'Not this,' 'Not that,' what would have been the result? There would have been neither his mistakes, nor his good deeds, for Friar Joseph would have ceased to be; there would have been only an undifferentiated, quality-less Something, to which Mr. Huxley without justification gives the name Godhead, because he cannot quite cast off his Christian associations—Godhead is no translation of Brahma or Sat or Tat.

Mr. Huxley's treatment of mysticism is only incidental to his main theme, which is the relation between religion and power-politics. For a far more careful study we should have to turn to Rudolf Otto's *Mysticism East and West* (New York, 1932). This compares in detail Eckhardt, the Christian mystic, one of those whom Mr. Huxley approves as being in the pure mystic tradition, with Sankaracharya, who worked out to its ultimate logical conclusions the Vedantism of the Upanishads. The first half of the book does justice to the astounding similarities, which have deceived superficial thinkers into the assumption that mystics everywhere say the same things, because they use the same language. But the second half reveals the differences, far more fundamental, between these two types of mysticism, and without presuppositions about which is 'higher' and which is 'lower,' indicates the inevitable respective outworkings in human life. We will give only one of them. Sankaracharya's is a 'cool, still mysticism,' the realization of identity with an attributeless Existence. Its logical outcome in life is Quietism. Eckhardt's is a 'dynamic mysticism,' the realization of oneness with the eternal and ceaselessly creating God, in whom there is 'a turning of Being itself in itself, . . . also a boiling up and pouring out of itself in itself . . . light penetrating light, itself whole penetrating the whole self.' In the Godhead itself is both rest and motion. Hence 'at the moment when the soul passes from works into complete devotion and composure, it achieves the real "inward work,": the one, whole, true, undivided and invisible. Where this work is performed in the ground and stillness of the soul, above space and time, it breaks forth in temporal works, without ceasing, without wherefore . . . in the free outpouring of a new and truly liberated will; and it is as incapable of resting as is the creating God.' In short, the soul united to Father, Son, and Spirit, can as little cease to act (though the act be interior such as mental prayer) as God can cease to create; and can as little cease to act redemptively as God can cease to redeem. If Father Joseph's activities did harm to Europe, that was not because his mysticism was of a Christian and not an Upanishadic type, but because his passionate ambition for the Bourbons led him away from union with God.

Literature.

HUMAN DESTINY.

The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol. II. *Human Destiny*, by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr (Nisbet; 15s. net). In his Preface to this volume—the second volume of his Gifford Lectures delivered at Edinburgh in 1939—the author says, 'the belief which informs these pages is that the Christian faith represents deeper sources of insight into the meaning of life and, therefore, also greater sources of power for the fulfilment of life than has been assumed in the main currents of modern culture.' It is especially this question of fulfilment that comes into the foreground of discussion here. What has been the fate of the redemptive idea in the main types of Christian theology? How far has there been a

proper reception of the truth it declares into the cultural responsibilities and ideals of life? What, on the basis of Biblical realism, is the meaningful relation of Christ as the Wisdom and Power of God to human history, compounded as that history is of natural necessity and the freedom of sinners? Such are some of the interests, intellectual and practical, which Dr. Niebuhr explores. The argument is on the high ground of the relations between grace and nature.

Dr. Niebuhr begins this study by consideration of Christianity as a Messianic religion. The paradoxical thing here is that the expected Christ of Hebrew faith becomes in Jesus the rejected Christ. As the Divine Word, as Revelation of the Love that is norm for life, He tastes suffering and death. This is the tragic dimension in life and history. It is a final truth about historical destiny, for there is that in man's finitude and sinful freedom which will remain recalcitrant to the Divine. But it is not pure tragedy. For man the law of love 'opens up indeterminate possibilities of good in both individual and collective life.' 'Agape' has validations in history. For God the frustrations of 'Agape' are tragic but God has 'a resource of mercy beyond His law and judgment which He makes effective 'by taking the consequences of His wrath and judgment upon and unto Himself.'

To this complexity of facts in the sphere of grace the Pauline theology is consistently faithful. How far have the great historical debates succeeded in respecting that same complexity? With this, and very critically, the main part of succeeding chapters deals. The recurring temptation in Christian thought has been to obscure the complex relation between grace as power and grace as pardon. For many readers there will be special interest in Dr. Niebuhr's analysis of this in the Reformation and Renaissance contexts. The Catholic synthesis heals the hurt of the people too lightly. The Reformation has the final truth about life, but there was a 'defeatism' in the Lutheran, and an 'obscurantism' in the Calvinist practice which prevented Reformation truth from entering creatively into the cultural tasks of the age. This explains in part the triumph of the Renaissance, and the gains in that triumph must be insisted upon, though it led to an optimism which nearly made shipwreck of any religious valuation of the depth in life.

There is therefore need for a new synthesis, and the attainment of it will be difficult inasmuch as it will have to be a togetherness in tension. Both for thought and action it will be a confession of 'having' and 'not having.' Grace frees the Christian to act in history but not to forget the ambiguity of all his good. Grace as wisdom gives him the truth but no idealistic lordship in it. This has consequences for the problem of tolerance, and the struggle for justice to which Dr. Niebuhr gives two searching chapters. Here he comes close up to the world crisis in which both Church and community life stand to-day. Fanaticism in thought and anarchy in government—how may faith save and conduct resolute men in and through these? The final chapter is a complicated attempt to determine the status of the individual who has both before history and God 'finis' and 'telos.' In our wisdom about destiny 'contrition must mitigate our pride without destroying our hope.'

This scanty summary does little justice to what is a weighty and arresting book. It is concerned with the relevance of the gospel for life. The tendency is strong here to read the word 'gospel' as 'comforted despair.' His theology of transcendence will not allow Dr. Niebuhr to concede much to man. He makes an unclear use of traditional terminology with regard to the Atonement. The rest that remaineth for God's people finds but muted attention, in comparison with the insistence upon the evil in every good, and the pride of man ever frustrating his true end. There will be many for whom more than that requires to be said before justice is done to the meaning for life here and now of the Vision of God as Suffering Love. But they will accord to this challenging interpretation their great respect.

JOHN MACLEOD.

AN ESSAY IN FAITH.

Another remarkable book has come from the pen of 'Nicodemus,' anonymous author of 'Midnight Hour.' Its title, *Renascence: An Essay in Faith* (Faber & Faber; 8s. 6d. net), indicates what in the author's view is the deepest and most urgent spiritual need of our times. It is an 'essay,' and as such disclaims all pretence of being systematic or complete. The author, learned and able and spiritually sensitive as he is, is in any case too modest to make such a claim. All he would ask is that this new book may be taken as containing the reflections of his mind on what in the previous book were the outpourings of his heart.

As he reviews what he has written here at so many times and from so many angles he is conscious of the emergence of a single pattern formed within its variety, which he calls 'the Pattern of the Cross.' Here it is in words which, incidentally, supply a good summary of the contents of the volume: 'Every road which I have followed has led me to that "Rome." Whether I have studied T. S. Eliot's "nether world" of consciousness, Dr. Martin Buber's *World of Thou*, the significance of tradition or personality, the relation of religion and catastrophe, pagan and Christian wisdom, creative and conservative Christianity, probed the foundations of Renaissance art or contemplated the mystery of Salisbury Cathedral, downland spring, or the fore-down Thames, I have always, and often to my surprise, found myself at last in the presence of this "Pattern of the Cross."'

One might gather, and one would rightly gather, from these words that the author ranges widely in literature and art, in history, in theology and philosophy; that he indulges at times a poetic fancy; and that he subscribes to the central truth of Christian living. It should, however, be explained that in his view the 'Pattern of the Cross' is not to be found in Christianity alone. He himself would defend the Christian faith in its full Incarnational type; but he regards the only real hope of Society as, meantime at least, depen-

dent on a sub-Christian federation which might be called the 'Community of the Spirit.' In that federation 'dying into life' (which is the 'Pattern of the Cross') would be, as we might say, the highest common factor.

Here is his diagnosis of the present situation. It is a conflict between 'Being' and 'becoming.' On the one side, faith in transcendent Spirit, the source and bourne of all 'becoming,' with its fundamental law of 'dying into life,' resulting in the process of regeneration or renascence; on the other side, belief in mere 'becoming,' a merely immanent and natural *élan vital*, with its fundamental law of 'telluric' life, that is, in Pauline terms, life not 'after the Spirit' but 'after the flesh.' This latter, it is said, is the creed of all those who are now destroying or sapping our civilization.

In our opinion the author exaggerates sometimes, and sometimes generalizes too sweepingly. But we are attracted by the sincerity of his expositions and impressed by their vigour and eloquence; and we think there is practical wisdom, if not strict doctrinal consistency, in his vision and hope of a common meeting-ground between Christianity and the higher humanism of our time.

W. Fulton.

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF.

The Church Faces the Future: being the Third Report of the Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis, as presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May 1943 (S.C.M.; 1s. 3d. net.)

The New Order in the Church, by Professor William Adams Brown (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.50).

The Report presented last year to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland by Professor John Baillie, 'God's Will in Our Time,' was widely read (fourteen thousand copies have already been sold) and deeply appreciated. It contained profound and moving thoughts expressed in language that made them accessible to the great mass of Church people.

Dr. Baillie begins with an essay on the nature of the Church. One would feel disposed to say that it is somewhat elementary but for the fact that the doctrine of the Church has been dreadfully neglected in Presbyterian circles in Scotland. Our traditional Scottish evangelical religion has had two grave faults: it has been too intellectual (neglecting the symbolic or sacramental) and it has been too individualistic (laying almost exclusive emphasis on personal salvation). And so every word of Dr. Baillie's simple statement was needed and will, I hope, be enlightening. Just as necessary, perhaps even more so, is the section of the Report on 'The Church's Concern in Education,' for the Church has not awakened, and is not now awake, to the vital task of training its own young people systematically and the kindred task of labouring to have religion recognised as the essential foundation of any true education in the day school.

But the section of the Report which will occasion most of what Dr. Baillie calls 'stimulating thought and discussion' is the concluding one on 'The Reconstruction of the International Order.' With everything that Dr. Baillie says here there will be sympathy and what I may call conditional agreement. He calls for international unity and says the Church should press for this. 'For nations as for individuals there is but one way of salvation —the way of loving fellowship with one another within the forgiving love of God in Christ Jesus. To commend this solution to the world is the Church's primary task of evangelism.' And he even goes the length of saying that 'the Church must be realistic in the sense of facing the facts.'

At this point Dr. Adams Brown has something to say. His large and interesting book is a standing query to Dr. Baillie's statements. How can the Church talk to statesmen about 'loving fellowship,' he in effect says, when the Church herself is so divided, not only into fragments but largely in spirit? How can the Church ask secular leaders to face the facts when the facts of her own life are so distressing? Dr. Brown's book is an insistent call to the Church to reform herself as a preliminary to reforming the world. He says that the Church needs four things—a real fellowship, a unifying faith, economic sharing, and a world-wide understanding—and at present she has none of these in any effective sense. How little she can claim to have a 'loving fellowship' is made painfully apparent in Dr. Brown's remarks about the Lord's Supper. He is reduced to the pathetic suggestion that 'if we cannot sit down together at the same table we can celebrate the Sacrament on the same day and in our thoughts and prayers join our fellow Christians of other names in the common adoration of our one Lord.' Think of it. In this day of grace our adoration of our one Lord will not persuade us to sit down together at His table. It is not easy to imagine how 'secular' people who really face facts will describe this attitude. Dr. Brown has many other criticisms of the Church, on its economic side, on the training of its ministers, on its educational shortcomings, on its failure in faith. But nothing shows its spiritual blindness more pitifully than the fact that to very many a common participation in the Holy Supper should be regarded as a far-off goal instead of a present means and expression of union in faith and love.

Both of these books have something of value to say to our time. But the reader of Dr. Baillie's book will be none the worse of a serious consideration of Dr. Adams Brown's. F. J. Rae.

The Swarthmore Lecture for 1943 was given by the Rev. Leyton Richards, M.A., the subject being *Planning for Freedom* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). We are perhaps a little bored by the reiteration of this slogan. But no one will be bored by Mr. Richards' discussion of it. His general theme might be said to be the reconciliation of freedom and authority, and the solution perfect freedom through obedience, or freedom and obedience as two sides of the same thing. The practical nature

of the discussion may be seen in one of the author's illustrations: We enjoy the freedom of the road only by virtue of a strict observance of the rule of the road. *There* are authority and freedom in a concrete case, and no philosophical discussion could put it more plainly. There are of course many topics that arise in the pursuit of such a theme. We even have a very illuminating treatment of the Holy Trinity. Inevitably the federal solution of the problem of the freedom of states and the possibility of a sovereign state including them all comes up for treatment. Mr. Richards rather flirts with the idea of federalism. But in this he hardly reflects the way men's thoughts are trending. It is becoming more and more unlikely as we think of it that states will give up any of their sovereign status. And federalism is fading away as a probable goal of the world problem. On these matters, however, and other kindred matters Mr. Richards has much to say that is helpful and stimulating.

The Day Is At Hand (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) is a discussion of 'The Christian Church and Tomorrow' by Alec Boggis and Kenneth Budd; a layman and a parson. It takes the form of letters in which the layman, who is deeply concerned for the future of the Church, pours out criticisms into the parson's sympathetic ears. While the criticisms are particularly directed against the doctrine and practice of the Church of England, there is much in them of interest for members, lay and clerical, of other branches of the Christian Church. The writers are at one in the belief that nothing less than a 'second Reformation' within the Church itself will be necessary before it can undertake the tasks awaiting it in a more righteous social order. Mr. Budd suggests, however, that the weakness of the Church has been not so much deficiency in charity or feebleness of will as 'a fearful poverty of imagination.' There is a good deal in that.

A selection from the writings of the late Rev. James Ellis is given us in *Ventures in Fellowship: Suggestions for Class-Leaders* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). Mr. Ellis was a well-known and influential Methodist leader. According to his friend the Rev. E. G. Barton, who writes a foreword, he was gifted with unusual culture, with a riotous sense of humour and the goodness of a saint. All these qualities are illustrated in these addresses. There are twenty-eight of them and they give us what may be regarded as the best kind of Methodist preaching. They were meant for the 'Class Meeting' and there runs through them the sense of fellowship in the big things. All sorts of aspects of the human experience are treated with a freedom and suggestiveness which must have made them well worth hearing. They are just as well worth re-hearing in print.

The Ministry of the Lay Preacher, by the Rev. G. C. Leader, B.D. (Kingsgate Press; 1s. 6d. net), is a little book crammed full of good things which are modestly 'offered to Lay Preachers by one who is proud to remember that once he was among them.' It is marked by sound wisdom, wide reading, and deep experience. For its size it is singularly comprehensive, and ordained preachers as well as lay will find in it much that is helpful and most stimulating.

A helpful book will be found in *Faith and Fortitude: Twelve Talks*, by Miss Eleanor M'Dougall, D.Litt. (Lutterworth Press; 2s. net). Dr. M'Dougall was for many years Principal of the Woman's Christian College at Madras. The talks reprinted here appeared month by month in a woman's magazine, and each was called forth by the appearance of some special problem. They were well worth collecting in book form, for they are all informed by a sanctified common sense varied by humour and sometimes distinct originality. Some of the topics are forgiveness, patience, prayer (one of the best), irritability, 'you can't have it both ways,' crabbed age and youth, and the secret of fortitude. The background of all of them is the recognition of God.

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary, a well-known and much appreciated visitor to this country, was invited by the British Ministry of Information to spend eighty days in England last summer. He preached, lectured, and talked to groups of officers and men in Army camps, at luncheon clubs, at public meetings, and out of all this has come a book, *Living Democracy* (Oliphants; $1.50 net). The substance of it appeared in many British periodicals and some American. There are two clearly different kinds of article. One is about places and people and is a kind of interpretation of Americans and ourselves to each other. The other consists of addresses on topics like 'Finding God' and 'The Great Stabilities.' The two kinds are equally interesting. What Dr. Hough has to tell us of American education, for example, is enlightening. What he has to tell us about ourselves is on the whole comforting. The kind of book Dr. Hough has produced is a very attractive one, because of its miscellaneous character and its dominant human note. He is obviously a man of great ability, but he should follow the advice of Archbishop Whately and 'verify his references.' He says that 'when the Reform Bill of his period had passed, Benjamin Disraeli made the observation which has achieved a fame of its own: "Now we must educate our masters."' The original of this saying was part of a speech uttered by Robert Lowe in the House of Commons in 1867, 'I believe it will be absolutely necessary that you should prevail on our future masters to learn their letters.' This has been popularized as 'we must educate our masters,' but apparently no one knows who popularized it.

The Battlefield Your Parish.

An Address given to Scottish Chaplains.

By Professor Edgar P. Dickie, M.C., B.A., B.D., St. Mary's College, The University of St. Andrews.

It would be foolish for me to try to diagnose the state of mind prevailing in the Army to-day: you are always 'reading the battle' and know it better than any one else; but I should be surprised if there are not three factors at work there as they certainly are at work in the civilian mind.

1. There is an encouraging welcome for what has lately been known in European philosophy as *existential thinking*. The soldier, above all, knows that the spectator attitude is long ago condemned as unworthy and misleading. It is not by the onlookers, lolling at ease on the benches, that the contest is understood, but by those in the arena, in the dust and the heat and the blood.

2. Everywhere in the modern mind—and I should imagine that the soldier is no exception—there is, about spiritual matters, *a dangerous optimism*. In war-time the 'good fellow theology' gains a quick entrance, the theology of Omar Khayyam,

> He's a Good Fellow, and 'twill all be well.

The soldier is risking his life and enduring hardship for an ideal: therefore God, surely, will not be too stern with him. Mankind is suffering from an easy conscience, alarmingly complacent about man's nature and man's destiny. Men have not begun to realize their own needs and the desperateness of their situation.

3. There is the inevitable, invariable, baffling trial of preacher and pastor—*the prevailing apathy*. In its worst manifestations it arises from the disease of which we have just spoken: it is the consequence of a complacent estimate of human nature. But even at its worst it can serve us as one more proof of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. There is this appalling weight and drag of sheer indifference and yet—things happen! things which no human effort can possibly explain. Just when they're safest, there's a sunset touch.

Ramparts against Belief in God.

One way of viewing your task would therefore represent it as the obverse of Apologetics, and we might examine four types of attitude which set up barriers against the invasion of God, against the inrush of the Holy Spirit. The first three represent a challenge to the whole idea of revelation.

1. *The Scientific Attitude.* Technical terms and technical ideas have filtered down to the man-in-the-street from the scientist—possibly from the scientist's own popularizing of his subject—and quite often the technical terms come down unaccompanied by any technical idea. In general, the feeling is that the scientist, quite rightly, refuses to accept anything which he cannot prove. And indeed that is quite true and quite right for the scientist in his own sphere. But we have to ask, 'What do we mean by saying, "Accept nothing that you cannot prove"?' What is meant by 'proof'? Not certainly weighing and counting and measuring and analysing. When we have done all of these we have not come anywhere near the heart of what we are examining. In connexion with a living object, dissection is murder. In the very effort to understand it by this method the object is altered beyond recognition. Imagine the man in an ordnance factory whose only method of testing shells is by firing them all off. 'Not a dud in the lot!' 'Yes,' says the manager, 'but where are my shells?' *If* life is to be understood at all, there must be some other way of understanding it than the way of scientific experiment.

More important—even in his own sphere the scientist must begin with certain presuppositions: these must be accepted before his work can even begin; and they cannot be proved. Let me mention two of them. (i.) He must accept the *rationality of the universe*; and (ii.) he must accept the *competence of the mind*. Without the first he could not even commence his work. If the universe were not rational, all his experiments would be unreliable. And without accepting the second presupposition, the competence of the mind, he could not conduct his experiments. The reliability of the mind is essential before he can assess evidence and draw conclusions. The *therefore* of the syllogism is a very important part of it.

Acceptance of these two axioms alone carries him a very long way. If the universe is reasonable, may it not also be purposeful? And, if purposeful, may it not be good? May its rationality be the sign of a rational Ruler? And, again, if the mind of man is competent, may this endowment perhaps be trusted also in other spheres—for example, in

that of morality and human conduct or in that sphere where the noblest minds have shown their best gifts, the sphere of faith and religion? The person who simply ignores these vast possibilities does not have the scientific attitude.

2. *The Psychological Attitude.* The strength of the monistic criticism is more apparent when it questions the supremacy of mind and spirit and seeks to give predominance to Nature. The challenge is taken up by psychology.

Those theories which declare religion to be *illusion* employ very frequently the blessed word 'Wish-fulfilment.' The attitude of the believer, they say, is expressed in the exclamation, 'All this is too good not to be true!'

But so often it happens that faith compels its votaries to do things they are very far indeed from wishing. It is absurd to say that the martyr's death is the outcome of wishful thinking. It is indeed easier to find wish-fulfilment in the non-believer: he may be one who deeply desires a universe in which there shall be no God and no moral law. 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God' (Ps 14[1]). This is *practical* atheism. The man wishes there were no God in heaven to interfere with his longings and his lusts: therefore he soon comes to believe that there is in fact none.

3. *Humanistic Belief.* Is humanism enough? Is it sufficient to believe in man and his apparently boundless possibilities? There are those who say, 'The highest and noblest that we know is in man: think of his heroism, his kindliness, his sacrifice. Do we need more?' But on the other side, we are witnessing the collapse of man's confidence in himself. The Germans have rejected the concept of sin, calling it 'a delusion of the synagogue.' It is significant that this nation, which professes to believe in the goodness of man, and especially of the German man, will go down to history in infamy because of its fanatical hatreds and its satanic violence.

What is the real foundation of our faith in man? It is the belief that he is made by God and loved by God. The true anthropology has been put into words by Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais, in Cyrene: 'A thing of price is a man because for him Christ was crucified.'

4. The fourth attitude is that which claims that *morality is enough.* It is certainly a good beginning, but it does not take seriously the fact of sin. Here again we come back to current psychology and to its more trivial interpretations in the mind of the partially instructed.

(i.) We are called by the psychologist to consider certain infantile, or pre-natal, or racial kinks in man's spirit. The weakness of the theory lies in the fact that man stubbornly insists on accepting responsibility for his own misdeeds: he refuses to be classed as sub-human and irresponsible.

(ii.) There enters a new character—the Super-Ego. It demands, not 100 per cent. obedience, but 200 per cent. perfection! But there is a fallacy here also. The standard by which we judge and condemn ourselves and our conduct is not an interior one but an exterior; not our best self, nor even our idealized, more-than-perfect self: it is God as seen in the purity and love of Jesus.

Morality alone, then, is not sufficient, for two outstanding reasons. (*a*) Without God, we should not have the power to perform. (*b*) Without God, we should not have pardon when we fail to perform.

(*a*) Thomas Carlyle used to insist that he who would act greatly must also believe strongly. The power of an ethical movement is determined by its religious force.

(*b*) Nature cannot speak the word 'pardon': neither can the moral law. Thus, knowing the frailty of human endeavour, we see that pure moralism is a pessimistic creed. Hope returns only when we live in the belief that men serve a God who forgives, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting.

It begins to appear, therefore, that the real barriers to faith are those of our own erecting. Faith is hindered by man's own unfaithfulness.

Dr. W. R. Inge insists again and again that faith is an experiment which ends in an experience. Man decides to make the venture of faith and, having made it, discovers that his trust is vindicated in life and leads to a fuller knowledge. Dr. Inge is right, except in one particular. The first stage is not man's experiment but man's experience. God takes the initiative. The experiment cannot be set in train until man is able to declare, 'It pleased God to reveal His Son in me.'

The Chaplain as Servant of the Word.

When he was engaged in painting his pictures, William Blake worked by direct command of God and in a state of white-hot emotion, in momentary terror lest he should not carry out in the minutest detail the divine requirements. To Palmer, then a young man, he once said, 'Do you work with fear and trembling?' 'Yes,' was the reply, and thenceforth Blake loved him. The question might be asked of us as preachers Sunday after Sunday, 'Do we work in fear and trembling?' (But with a difference; because we can make even more properly our own the dying words of Blake, 'It is not mine! It is not mine!') We preach always in anxiety and under tension, since we are preaching every time *for a verdict.*

How momentous that Moody preached a noble

and convincing and solemnizing sermon that day when one of the audience was the young man who had dropped in to the church out of curiosity, Wilfred Grenfell of Labrador.

Each time we preach we are preaching for a verdict. And time after time among your congregations on active service there will be some who have that day their last opportunity.

What is it that in preaching we seek to do? First, I imagine, to give our hearers *a nobler idea of God*. At the close of the service we should dismiss them 'into a world transformed.' Second, to convey that which will stand *the test of Monday morning*, and your hearers may go out to very dangerous fires of mental and moral testing. Third, to warn them of danger and *destroy self-complacency*. The French King (Louis XIV) said to Massillon, 'I have heard several great orators and have been much pleased with them: as for every time I hear you I am much displeased with myself.' Fourth, to bring the promise of the *peace of God* to the tortured soul. We are not to be repelled either by the coarse sinner or by the unspiritual dullard. It would be just as absurd for a minister of the Word to be angry with people for their sinful or apathetic state as for a doctor to lose his temper with a patient suffering from cancer. It is the minister's business and the doctor's business to treat the malady, not to resent it.

Your position is vastly different from that which you occupied in the parish and congregation. In these three ways, for example:

1. You fall heir to no substantial frame-work of parish organization, with its band of loyal and permanent office-bearers and women workers and devoted laymen who give the best of their leisure to the church. You have largely to create your own frame-work, and that means the constant practice of devolution. Often it is so much easier to do the job yourself; more economical in time and energy than to train others to do it for you. And yet I imagine that it is always part of a minister's life to spend time training others to do a bit of work, even though they may in the end do it less well and less quickly than the minister himself. For then it becomes *their* show; above all, they feel that they count for something in Christian work. Unless you are very fortunate, you inherit no trained choir: you have to establish one. And very helpful they can be. (There are, of course, other methods of encouraging good singing. One chaplain noticed that the first hymn was sung with great indifference and complete absence of fire. Before he announced the next, he said, 'You know that I can preach for ten minutes—or I can preach for half an hour. If the singing is not much better I'll preach for half an hour.' That time it lifted the rafters.)

2. You are no longer spoiled and cosseted by a devoted congregation. The affection of parishioners is quite overwhelming and quite unintelligible. You would imagine that we should be quite content if they would just endure us! but, instead, if we cough, we shake a whole parish with anxiety. Principal Denney used to say that the minister was not so much the pastor of the congregation as its pet lamb. Think of the pairs of warm gloves and socks which Christmas brings to us. It is true that my own present parishioners, the students, never seem to think of these things; and they may probably escape the mind of the soldiers too. No; you have to start from zero and win their respect and loyalty and affection. When the chaplain goes abroad with his own unit on active service things are changed and made easier, for all are now sharing the same life and facing the same dangers.

3. There is one special case of the absence of frame-work. You cannot delegate any of the systematic teaching of Christian doctrine and the Christian life to any one else. You have no Sunday School teachers or Bible Class leaders; and you cannot assume that the majority of your congregation have passed through these educational stages. It is best to assume nothing, and, just as you ask what hymns are desired, to inquire occasionally what themes would be helpfully dealt with in the addresses. For, in the second place, *their life is also radically altered.*

(1) They are faced by what to some minds is one of the most distressing features of army life—the continual lack of solitude. There is no opportunity for quietly thinking things over in your own soul; and private devotions are difficult. With many there may be slowness of adjustment—with some even maladjustment—to community-life. Possibly it is even simpler than that: a man may be merely bored by his new companions. He finds the majority grand fellows but they are, frankly, uncongenial. He would cheerfully go through hell with them in battle; but the small-talk of barracks is purgatory, without compensation.

(2) There are no wives to take them along to church. And how many men in peace-time would be lost souls if their wives did not take them quietly in hand!

(3) Home-sickness is a disturbing factor. Always present among men who are happy in their domestic life (and there is a larger proportion of older, married men in the Army to-day) it is intensified by the fact that so many are stationed in the home country. My own investigations seem to show that this nostalgia is more disturbing when home is still within reach. On service abroad, it may be more intense, but the fact that nothing can be done about it anyway prevents

the tension being a troublesome feature. Into our Church canteen in Lille in the spring of 1940 came a man on his way to England on a fortnight's leave. Four days later he appeared back again. Faced with the prospect of having to say good-bye to his wife and children at the end of his leave, he preferred not to take it. He sent a telegram to his wife, she called him on the telephone. They talked for a little, and then he went straight back to France. But home-sickness has another side: it can be used for good. It has been found that men cut off from the stability of home-life are often more susceptible to the appeal of the stable things in ethics and religion. Home-sickness is a very real *praeparatio evangelica*. Blessed are the home-sick, for they shall reach home.

(4) It is a conscript army. Those who had the real volunteer spirit had less time and less opportunity than in the Four Years' War to give an example, to set a standard and to act as leaven. It is, therefore, important to inculcate that spirit by asking on every possible occasion for volunteers. A man is never so proud as of something he has done successfully when it wasn't his duty, and he needn't have done it unless he chose to. Moreover, men's roots have not yet gone deeply into the new life: thus pride in regiment and tradition have not played their due part. There is still a touch of political discontent and class suspicion, by which some are ready to be ignorantly persuaded that they are fighting for other people's gain; and there is moral and spiritual weakness, expressing itself by wishful thinking, refusing to recognize the justness of our cause. If a man has not the zeal and the courage to face up to a challenge, he will usually persuade himself that he is not deficient in these qualities; it is merely that the cause for which they are demanded does not appeal to him. He persuades himself that it is 'another imperialistic war': it would be a different thing if they were fighting for the working-man; the implication being that *then* you would see what a lion of courage he could be. But he will, in fact, always be the mouse unless he is strengthened morally and spiritually.

How is the situation to be met? Not by a multiplication of preachments. Lancelot Andrewes once declared, 'He who preacheth twice a day, prateth once.' Nor is the requirement simply greater erudition, eloquence, or sensationalism. We should all prefer to be the kind of preacher of whom it was said, 'I would rather listen to his repetitions than to most other men's novelties.' We look, in fact, for three characteristics.

1. *Simplicity*. There is something quite fundamental here. (Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not—*clarity*! . . .) But simplicity itself is not enough; that alone might be merely stuff for the simple-minded; and the troops are not that: it must be the simplicity which has grown out of profundity. The gospel is *not* just common sense: who could have *thought out* the idea of the holy love of God? But its deepest depths *can* be presented in terms that will be understanded of the common people. The common folk heard Jesus gladly; and He spoke as one having authority. Jesus spoke, while the Rabbis stammered.

Again, there is no regimental passing-out test for religion: you cannot assume that they are trained soldiers in this respect; yet we must not proceed as if they were all outcasts and pagans. All are probably *tired*, with that natural somnolence of mind which comes through unaccustomed or exacting physical effort and exposure. There is a special place for stories of heroism. We recognize that deep hush which falls on an audience when they listen to tales of sacrifice, and the solemnizing effect which may be secured. Is there, perhaps, scope for recounting from time to time the deeds which won the regiment's battle-honours? More important, there are treasure-houses of missionary stories which have never been fully employed; combining travel and adventure with a devotion which is purely Christian. They are the best illustrations of the appeal of a Master who can call forth loyalty and supreme heroism. There are, too, the examples of Christian generals. In 1918 Marshal Foch, absent at a time when many wanted to consult him, was supposed to be in private, writing his *directives* for the great offensive soon to be launched; but they discovered him at last kneeling before the altar of the little village church. Mr. H. G. Wells once sneered, before American audiences, at Britain's 'praying generals.' One imagines that the men at Dunkirk placed more reliance on the prayers of Lord Gort than on all the rantings of rationalist orators.

2. The second requirement of the evangelistic address is that it should be *positive*. How can we best assist men to meet temptations? By setting before them the positive side of the Christian demand; by holding up to their contemplation the holiness of Christ.

How shall we help them to face doubts? Again by showing them the positive side; by preaching in season and out of season the cardinal doctrines of Christianity; the great, boundless, strengthening truths of the faith. Rabbi Duncan once told of an incident which remained vividly in his mind. A lady said to him, in despair, 'The more I see of myself, I see nothing so properly mine as my sin.' He replied, 'Well, you do not see deep enough. There is something far more properly yours than your sin; and your sin is improperly yours. It is a blot in your being, which, if you do not get

quit of it, will never cease to be *unnatural* to you. No; the image of God is more properly yours, though you had no share in the production of it.' It is often hard, when men are faced with this ultimate and terrifying doubt—whether their sins can really be forgiven—to bring conviction and new hope. There is a helpful incident in the experience of Martin Luther. He had become a 'scrupulant,' suffering from that spiritual invalidism which must ever be at confession and yet is assailed by doubts immediately thereafter and afraid that grace has once again been forfeited. He was advised—and the advice brought him relief—to *personalize* the creed. Instead of saying 'I believe in the forgiveness of sins' he was to say, 'I believe in the forgiveness of *my* sins.'

3. Great evangelical preaching must therefore be *personal*. Preaching is 'truth mediated through personality.' Some preachers, shy and reserved, give only the truth and suppress their personality: others give their personality and suppress the truth.

If it is our own witness, it will speak sincerity: if it is our own faith, it will carry conviction. The evangelical preacher should come to men as Lord Lister did to the poet Henley in the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh:

> His faultless patience, his unyielding will,
> Beautiful gentleness and splendid skill . . .
> His wise, rare smile is sweet with certainties,
> And seems in all his patients to compel
> Such love and faith as failure cannot quell.

Faith is strengthened most of all, not by argument, but simply by the influence of a soul that is 'sweet with certainties.'

A fine tale comes down from the last war. An officer, setting out on a difficult patrol, said to the chaplain, 'Padre, will you pray for me?' The answer was, 'No; but I'm coming with you.' Metaphorically that is sound. We stand with them through everything. There must be the bond of deep affection. Their shame is ours. Christ stands with them, and for their eyes you are His symbol.

Though rejoicing in every honest word of encouragement, which means that our message has gone home and been helpful to some one, we shall not seek praise, nor be affected by it one way or another. When Massillon was congratulated on his preaching, he said, 'The devil has already told me this more eloquently than you.'

Much of our best preaching is done when we are not preaching. In sermon manuscripts we may not write to last; but we write also in souls. That means that you must meet each man where he stands. It means mixing with them, understanding their life, going with them in forced marches, sharing their austerities, accepting no comforts which are not available for every one. All that is part, however, of the witness of every Christian in the services, of combatant officers and N.C.O.s as well as of chaplains. Something else is needed from the padre. While some may praise him most because he throws himself with zest into sport and amusement; or because he learns to fire a Bren gun; nevertheless the men in general want to find in their chaplain above all a 'man of God.'

Many of your men must appear as little more than boys, and all of them are young in spirit. To think of them is to recall the haunting words of Judah concerning Benjamin, 'How shall I go up to my father, and the lad be not with me?' Have no fear. The issue does not lie with you: it is in safer hands. The results may be long delayed: many of them you may never know. But do not be discouraged. Far off, and long after they have passed out of your care, men will be fighting temptation, or facing great danger, and there will come to them some word which you spoke, some kindly act which you did for them long ago, and they will stand fast. They will thank God for you and take courage.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Pied Piper.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'Suffer the little children to come unto me.'—Mk 10^{14}.

A short time ago, when the schools were breaking up and the holiday season beginning, I was leaving the city by the afternoon train when a lady asked me whether I would see a small boy safely to his home. I said I would, and the boy and I soon became friends. And then at the junction, where we changed trains, a gentleman came up and asked whether I would convoy a small girl to the same town. So the three of us now went on. I think had there been any more changes I should soon have had a whole collection of boys and girls. Indeed it made me feel a sort of Pied Piper.

I'm sure now you've all heard or read of the

original Pied Piper and the way he charmed children. He first of all, you remember, rid Hamelin Town of its plague of rats.

Into the street the Piper stept,
Smiling first a little smile,
As if he knew what magic slept
In his quiet pipe the while.

Then when the rats had followed him and were drowned in the river, the Mayor didn't keep his promise to 'pay the piper.' So the piper was furiously angry, and

Once more he stept into the street
And to his lips again
Laid his long pipe of smooth straight cane.

Only this time he drew all the children after him and they disappeared into an opening in the mountain. That, anyhow, is the story of the Pied Piper.

It seems, however, that some one has used the same idea for a novel, now made also into a cinema film called 'The Pied Piper.' On the fall of France a Mr. Howard sets out with a friend's boy and girl to try to get to the safety of Britain. He, as the Pied Piper did, collects other children as they go on, a French girl and boy, and a Dutch boy, until he has five altogether. At last the Nazis arrest them, and it looks as though their journey was stopped. However, a Nazi officer asks Mr. Howard to take also his Jewish niece, and helps them all to escape. So eventually this Pied Piper crosses the Channel with the six children and all arrive safely in this country.

I have actually met people, however, who had something of the Pied Piper's power, who seemed able to charm and attract children. For instance, I once met Dr. Donald Fraser, who was one of our most famous missionaries. He was a man with a wonderful smile which cast an immediate spell over children. Once when he was preaching in Africa a small black mite, with nothing on, seeing him on the platform slipped up beside him and held his hand till the service was over. And, of course, what made him so likeable and so lovable was a certain spirit in him, what we call a Christ-like spirit. It was because he was a follower of the most famous Pied Piper of all time, the lover and friend of all little ones, our own blessed Saviour Himself. Jesus had just that way with Him that made children trust Him, and come willingly to Him, and nestle closely 'in the crook of His arm,' as one very eminent writer expressed it. I hope you also have felt His charm and spell. I hope you will love to come to Him who gave such a gracious invitation, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me.'

I think, when I read that sweet story of old,
When Jesus was here among men,
How He called little children as lambs to His fold,
I should like to have been with them then;
I wish that His hands had been placed on my head,
That His arm had been thrown around me,
And that I might have seen His kind look when He said,
'Let the little ones come unto Me.'

Putting In and Getting Out.

By the Reverend John B. Nettleship, B.A., B.D., Manchester.

'Give, and it shall be given unto you.'—Lk 6[38].

I expect those of you who are rather older have been 'digging for victory,' and I daresay that even the smallest of you has a little plot of your own in some corner of Father's garden, where you can grow your very own things. And isn't it exciting when you get your first crop?

Some one I know wrote and said, 'Of course, you'll get out of your garden what you put into it.' Now of course that sounds obvious, doesn't it? If I planted carrots, I shouldn't expect peas, and if I sowed cabbage seeds, I know that I shouldn't get lettuce. Why, even in the Bible it says, 'Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?' Of course I shall get out of my garden what I put in! But my friend meant something more than that. You see, my garden had been rather neglected before I had it. Before I get the best results out of it, it will need several years' hard digging and attention. Year by year, my friend meant, as I put more and more hard work into it, I shall get better results . . . bigger, juicier peas, fatter vegetable marrows. . . . O what a garden mine will be!'

Yes, the more we put in, the more we get out. And that isn't only true of gardens . . . it's true of the whole of life. The story Jesus told about the two men who started to build their houses illustrates this. The first man dug deeply into the ground for his foundations . . . what a long, hard job it must have been. Apparently the second man couldn't be bothered to do all that. He just built his house on the sand. He didn't put half as much effort and work into it as the other man. But he didn't get half as much out, either. The first man got a house that would withstand the wind and the rain and the floods, but the second man got only a building that collapsed when the storms commenced. How he must have wished that he had put more into the building of his house. So you see that the things most worth having and doing in life need the best that we can put into them, and the more we put into them, the more we shall get out of them.

I want us to think of this especially as it applies to our church, for this principle works here too. I don't mean by 'putting in' simply what we put into the collection, though it is true there. If we put aside from our spending money, say a penny every week, as our very own contribution to our church or Sunday School, we shall get far more pleasure out of that than we shall by just going to Father on Sunday, and saying, 'Please, can I have my collection?'

However, when I talk about what we 'put in' to our church I mean much more than money. There are lots of ways, even while you are young, of working in and for your church, and as you get older those opportunities will grow if you are always on the look-out for things that

you can do, and for ways in which you can help.

How true this is of the services in the church too. How much do you put into the prayers in church? You know, it isn't just the minister who is praying. All the time you must be trying hard to realize that God is near to us, and is listening to what we are saying. And the more you do this, the more you will find that coming together into church and praying together to God is a happy and helpful thing. It is another of those things of which we can say, 'The more we put in, the more we get out.'

Then there are our hymns. Do you just sing without paying any attention to the words, or do you really try to mean what you sing? And the sermon. I know ministers sometimes talk about things that girls and boys don't understand, but if you try to listen I am sure you will find in every sermon, something—perhaps a little poem or a Bible story—that will interest you and make you want to be a follower of Jesus.

Come to church gladly, eagerly, singing and praying with all your hearts, longing to learn new things, and I know you will find joy in the services, and as you grow older, you will love your church more and more.

The Christian Year.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Stars in their Courses.

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD E. WHITE, B.D., MORETON, WIRRAL, CHESHIRE.

'They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.'—Jg 5^{20}.

While the song which comprises the fifth chapter of Judges is recognized by almost all scholars to be one of the earliest pieces of Hebrew literature in the Old Testament, and much that it contains must be judged in the light of its great antiquity, the story which lies behind the song, and the meaning which lies at the heart of our text are both remarkably modern. Israel was engaged in a protracted struggle for liberty and national independence in the land of Canaan; Sisera was leader of the Canaanite resistance, determined to suppress and absorb the 'invading' tribes. The atmosphere of fear and general disorganization of normal life is vividly portrayed: 'the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways; village life ceased, ceased in Israel.' We learn that the defenders of freedom were heavily outnumbered, for the total of Israel's men, ten thousand, is repeated as though it were a ridiculously small amount. Moreover, Sisera could strike terror into Israel by his 'nine hundred chariots of iron,' primitive armoured cars, utterly new to the nomad tribes. Israel suffered also from desperate shortage of munitions: 'was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?' To add still further to Israel's disadvantages, certain 'isolationist' tribes held aloof from the struggle; 'for the divisions of Reuben there were great searchings of heart—why abodest thou among the sheepfolds, to hear the bleatings of the flocks?' Gilead abode beyond Jordan, Dan in his ships, Asher near his sea-shore, neutrals who stood to gain by others' sacrifices, but risked nothing themselves. Even treachery had played its part in Israel's calamity. The bitterness of the curse pronounced upon the people of Meroz seems justifiable only by some undefined act of deliberate treason.

The picture has features all too familiar to ourselves, and altogether appears black and threatening. Yet, under the leadership of the prophetess Deborah, assisted by the young Barak, Israel won through to freedom, to national independence, and to a glorious destiny among the nations. Hence the song, and the text, which declares triumphantly that when men, and allies, and weapons were few, and trusted friends proved false, Israel found other, and higher, sources of help and deliverance—the very stars in their courses were with them in the struggle, the ancient river Kishon lent its aid in destroying their enemies, heaven and earth conspired with Israel, the whole universe was on her side, and all because Jehovah Himself marched with them.

Several things about this ancient war-song may not satisfy the modern Christian conscience, but here is a truth we cannot afford to leave behind us. For it is but a poetic expression of the fundamental truth of all religion, the primary faith of humanity, that the universe is on the side of right, that all things do work together to promote good, that the man who is in the right has God and the universe behind him, while the man who is in the wrong, whatever seeming advantages he may have, has set his course against the eternal current of things, and sooner or later the current will tell against him. It is possible that the form in which the truth is put is compounded of poetic fancy and primitive superstition regarding the effect of the stars on the tides, but the truth itself is simply that which philosophers utter when they declare that we live in a *moral* universe. And whether we prefer the poetic or the philosophic expression of it, the faith itself that at the heart of things is moral law, is too precious to lose.

We may perhaps make the truth vivid to our minds by reducing it to three simpler propositions. First, that experience reveals in the universe and in history a certain *preference* for goodness, a moral logic of events which secures that in the long run only good yields any permanent profit, or leaves any significant mark on the human story. In the individual's experience, as in contemporary history, this does not always seem to be true: but, seen in the light of mankind's experience as a whole, we do learn that whatever was evil had already within itself the seeds of its own decay, that error, because it is error, will ultimately fade from the minds of men, and that sinful self-interest, in man and in nation, leads inevitably on to death. We know that 'what is excellent, as God lives, is permanent'; while 'he that soweth to the flesh shall reap corruption.' Whether we think of stars in their

courses co-operating with good, or the mills of God grinding out the bad, we are in each phrase describing the fact that God has so made our world and us that evil works its own destruction while goodness and truth endure.

Experience reveals, secondly, in the universe and in history, a certain deep *purpose* of good. The saints have always felt that the universe is not blindly indifferent to their deepest struggles; that Nature yields up her secrets to the lovers of truth, and life yields up its highest joys to the lovers of virtue. He who strives upward has the current of history behind him. His toil is in line with the ultimate divine design. 'The whole creation groaneth and travaileth,' for God planned our world with the aim that it should bring forth a harvest of truth, beauty and goodness in the souls of all who pass through it on their way to glory. And though sometimes the tide of history seems to turn in eddying whirlpools that threaten to engulf all we hold sacred; though for a generation the divine purpose may seem to stand still, or even to recede, yet we know that the current is set, and slowly but surely, because God is behind it and Christ is in it, the world moves forward to that one far-off divine event, the final victory of Good, and the reign of God.

Finally, when we talk of a moral universe we mean also that there are in this world of ours *powers* on the side of good that guarantee that in the end truth and goodness must prevail. The race is not to the merely swift, nor the battle to the merely strong; forces of evil, however cunning and well-armed, must ever fail in the end against those higher powers of God which goodness can command. The universe is not a closed circle of purely human and material forces: God breaks in, as He did on Easter morning, on the side of right. The power of good may seem woefully inadequate, a mere benediction of the stars, against the embattled forces of tyranny, ambition and conquest, but our whole conscience, our whole understanding of Christ, our whole insight into the experience of the saints revolts against the thought that the future belongs to the more cynical, more ruthless, more blatantly false and ambitious of mankind. Rather do they persuade us that in the age-long struggle between right and wrong, good and evil, the universe is on the side of right, and there are unseen energies that silently and mysteriously take the side of virtue and truth and lead them on to victory.

Thus sang Deborah: the stars in their courses fought against the enemies of God's people: God and the universe are on the side of right. But one final word of caution is imperative. This is not a truth to be lightly assumed and carelessly applied to any conflict in which we may happen to be engaged. God and the universe are on the side of right—but *are we*? Only if we are on the Lord's side, in earnest about His kingdom, about His will being done on earth, about His plan for human living, can we truthfully and safely say the Lord is with us. God defends the right: we need to take care lest haply we be found to fight against God.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Man Who Made a God.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'And the residue thereof he maketh a god.'—Is 44^{17}.

This is the story of a man who had lost interest in the religion in which he had been brought up and had no further use for the true and living God. But when a man says that he is finished with God, that does not mean to say that God is finished with him. Having lost God, he sets about to make a god.

He goes out into the woods and sees a tree. He cuts it down and brings it home. Part of it he cuts into logs, and during many a cold, long night he can sit round a good fire and keep himself warm. Another part of it provides him with enough fuel to bake his bread and roast his meat for many days to come. And having satisfied the needs of the outer and the inner man in this way he finds that there is still some of the tree left. He can find no immediate, practical use for it, so he dedicates what is left over of the tree to the cause of religion. 'And the residue thereof he maketh a god.'

The residue for God! The reproach of that apportionment of a man's time and talent, possessions and opportunities has pointed many a needful sermon and will still continue to do so. What is not quite good enough for my own use—that is good enough for God. What is left over when I have done with it—that will do for God. The tree in its strength and vigour for myself—the stump for God. The cup of life, 'with beaded bubbles winking at the brim,' for myself—the lees, the dregs for God. Life's day, with its glory and promise, for myself—the eleventh hour for God. The resources of life for self—the residue for God!

For God? But the sting and stab of this story does not lie just there. When I give anything to God in that spirit, it is not to the true and living God that I give it, but to some private god of my own, a god that I myself have made. The text focuses upon that point—'and the residue thereof *he maketh* a god.'

But why make a god when there is a God already? It is because human nature, as it has been said, is 'God-bent.' If a man does not worship the true and living God he will and does worship a god of some sort nevertheless, usually himself. The psychology of it (if one cares to put it so) is that, when this man set up the tree-trunk and made a god out of it, it was himself that he was deifying. The name of this home-made god is Man himself and its number is Number One. This man, then, made a god:

(1) *Out of his wants.* He had every reason to be grateful to that tree, for it had satisfied his wants—the logs, his desire for warmth, and the fuel, his desire for food. And it was out of that tree, the tree of man's own desire, that he made for himself a god.

There is no more obliging, accommodating god

than the god a man makes up out of his own wants. You can pray to this god and say: 'My will be done on earth, as it never can be done in heaven.' You can appeal to this god and he will always give you a good reason for doing anything, however bad it may be, because the reason is that you want to do it. And this is why this home-made god is so popular. For this god's answer will always be: 'Do it, my son, if you want to do it,' whereas the real God would answer: 'Thou shalt not.'

(2) *Out of his belongings.* A thing really belongs to you when you can use it, and the more you can get out of a thing the more it belongs to you. And the prophet goes out of his way to point out that this man had been able to get a good deal out of this tree. In exchange for parts of this tree he had received physical comfort and bodily nourishment. It was a source of profit. 'I'll tell you,' said a man the other day, 'why I don't go to church. I go to the pictures, and I gladly pay my entrance fee, tax and all, because I get something out of it. I get amusement out of it. I go to my office because I get something out of that, too. I get my living out of it. But when people go to church, what do they get out of it?' There is, of course, a certain satisfaction in serving a god like that, made out of one's own belongings. As our Lord would say, 'they have their reward.'

(3) *Out of his daily surroundings.* We are not to think that there was anything very original in what this man was doing. The prophet would not have singled out this case for comment unless there had been an epidemic of that kind of idolatry. And this man had caught the fashion. Regular church-goers are sometimes twitted (by those who are above such frailties) with being 'the slaves of convention.' But, surely, the boot is on the other foot. There are many men and women who have given up the custom of public worship in deference to another custom, the custom of the set in which they move. And the god of one's daily surroundings can be a very exacting god, greatly to be feared and strictly to be obeyed.

'They have their reward,' Jesus would say, adding—'such as it is!' But how long will it last? What will be the end of the man who makes a god—out of himself, his wants, his belongings and his daily surroundings? One has only to take the initials of the god's own attributes and the answer comes—*he will be disappointed*! That is what the prophet himself says a few verses further on—'he feedeth on ashes.' Many generations afterwards St John said the same thing: 'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world.' Why not? Is it because one will be damned? No, not that: only disappointed—'for the world passeth away.' To-morrow? Maybe. The day after to-morrow? Perhaps. But certainly in the long run, ultimately, eternally—disappointed. And if that is not damnation it is difficult to know what is.

It comes, then, to this: the god you make will let you choose what you like, but no god that you make can make you like what you choose. That is the test; and it is only the man who worships the God who made man who comes well through that ordeal: 'I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness.'

God is the great Other One, not oneself, before whom, not only you and I, but 'every knee' must bow. God is He who believes in us and trusts us when every one else has given us up. God is He who loves us when we can no longer love even ourselves, because our self-love has at last turned to self-loathing and self-despair. There are many wonderful things that a man can do, a man can even make a god. But a man cannot make a god who can do the one thing worthy of a god, he cannot make a god who can save. Only God who made man can re-make and redeem.

'He feedeth on ashes.' That is the end of the man who made a god. But he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Three Men Seek Thee.

'While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee.'—Ac 10^{19}.

If some one without any knowledge whatever of the Bible were to ask me how he might wisely begin to read it, I should certainly not advise him to begin at the beginning. I think I should say to him that, if he wished to learn the message and test the claims of the Bible, he should open it first at the Acts of the Apostles. And for these reasons: The final aim of the Bible is to leave him face to face with Jesus, the Saviour of the World. But not this only. It is to leave him with a knowledge of Jesus Christ as a present personal Power and with a religion which is a living movement of the Spirit in history and in this present.

I think it, therefore, a wise thing that my inquirer should first make acquaintance with the record of a new power at work in the world. I should wish him to see that this new power not only revolutionized religion, but actually transformed man. I should like him to see that though this new power in the world arose in Jewish circles, it was not merely a development of Jewish ideas in religion, but in direct and devastating opposition to a theory of racial and religious exclusiveness, which lay at the heart of the Jewish creed and religion. Here was something come into the world which propounded an entirely new set of moral values. I would like my inquirer to see how, for the sake of it and by the power of it, frail men and women faced loss, persecution, death, with a serene courage—yes, and something more difficult for most people than any of these. Under it, they changed their minds, and cleansed out of them, ideas which had soaked into the very fibre of their natures, out of their racial and religious history. He would surely say, having read their record, 'Here are big things happening.' Why? How? So he would be ready to pass to the Gospels and pass with an awakened and eagerly questioning mind.

This introduction leads directly to the dream of the Apostle Peter, in a chapter of this Book of

Acts, which is one of the most formative as well as dramatic in the New Testament. This strange story is a landmark in the history and development of religion. It is the point at which there crashed into an old religion, which, in spite of protesters among its prophets, had remained narrowly racial and determinedly exclusive, a revolutionizing proclamation. To our hearing, it will come as a truism. To those who first uttered and heard it, it was an explosion under whose impact and upheaval some of the most inveterate fences and barriers were destroyed out of religion for ever. Here it is: God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him.

It is the evolutionizing impact of this upon one man's mind and religion that we are now to consider.

He was a religious Jew and in him many of the age-long characteristics of his race were incarnate. The emancipating moment does not arrive without preparation. There had been the experience of Pentecost, and this very man had himself stood up to interpret the meaning of that tremendous and exciting climax. He had opened an ancient scripture and saw: 'This day is this fulfilled. It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your young men see visions, and your old men dream dreams.' The preacher that day of Pentecost had then by no means perceived that he was saying something which would presently take hold of his own life and revolutionize his whole habit of mind. His own enlarging thoughts and experience were to be part of the fulfilment which he had declared to have come to that ancient prophecy.

Something from that day began to happen with this man. There is an incidental indication of it. He went away from Pentecost and he tarried many days in Joppa 'with one, Simon a tanner.' Why not? Every reason why not—if you were a Jew. To the Jew, a tanner was an unclean man in an unclean and abhorrent trade. He was not allowed to live and work within a given distance of a town. That is why we read here that his house was by the seaside.

Peter was asleep on a house-top. He dreams. Through the gate of dreams the instinctive spirit steals in and opening his hand shows him a new vista of truth. We will not stay to describe in detail that vision and dream. Strange reading to us, but most lucid and pertinent to the sleeping man. Unwelcome in its meaning, too. 'Not so, Lord,' said he; but he had to admit that it was so. He had to admit that the lower law under which his religious mind had taken form, and under which his life had been lived, had been swallowed up by a higher law. 'God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.'

That was a big thing to wake up and find you have learned it once for all, while you were asleep. He had learned that the Christ who saves men transcends the exclusiveness in which he had been reared. There had dawned on him the universalism of redemption, and before this truth, this man's ideas of religious caste broke up and the very fences of race went to pieces. Christ has come to see us under a nobler order. He said once, 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' Turning to His disciples, He said, 'Whosoever doeth the will of my Father that is in heaven, the same is my mother and sister and brother.' That is a word which even yet has only a partial and meagre and grudging acceptance. But we have to face it, and there are things in it which Christ's Spirit will yet unfold to us, and some of it will be to our embarrassment, not in the world only, but within the Church.

Now see one further thing in this story. Here is a man whom the Spirit of Christ is enlarging. A new truth has come to him in the mystery law of sleep. Now he is awake. He is pondering it. Will he have patience to unravel its meaning? Will he do with it what men do with new, changing thoughts? Stow them away or adjust them somehow to the old and leave them paralysed by their company? But the Spirit of Christ has not finished with him.

When a man has his vision of some truth which awakens his mind and enlarges his soul, life promptly knocks at his door and that knocking is God's way of at once clarifying and preserving his truth that has been given to that man to see. Great ideas and ideals cannot be left in cloudland. Visions fade as emotion grows less vivid, and the remedy is action. There is never given a vision or an ideal without the swift call to test its working values against the need of our own life and other people's. Straight on the vision comes the knocking! Three men seek thee! Go down and go with them. That is the way to try out the vision. Our great experiences are for use.

There is the enlargement which comes of knowledge. Have you had the blessing of a reasonably good education which has given you a broader horizon and outlook upon life? There is a knocking at your door. The world is wanting to know to-day if the educated man is worth what he has cost.

There are those who cultivate the religious life in a dilettante way, because they enjoy it, rather than for what it makes of them—either in the things of character or in the things of service. It is our task to turn our spiritual experiences to account, both in the improvement of our own life and in the helping of others. There was a mediæval mystic to whom one day was given an illumination as he prayed: a shining vision of truth he had not before perceived came to him, and he rose from his prayer and ran into his own garden in his joy to give God thanks. But when he returned to his desk, he was astonished to find he had entirely forgotten what it was that he had seen. Perhaps that devout man had better have taken the way out, that led not to his private garden, but into the common street. Maybe it would have been a better thanksgiving if he had taken the hand of the first neighbour he met and said, 'Share my exceeding good.'

If we think that we can divorce the life that is devout from the life that is useful, we are thinking

something which will likely be the ruin of both. By the hands of those who need us, Christ is knocking at the doors of our life. Arise, therefore, get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing.[1]

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Is Social Security Sufficient?

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'—Mt 4^4.

How very much there is to cheer the heart in every movement of the Spirit which finds expression in some great declaration of the rights of man. In the midst of the world's agony, men's eyes, perhaps, have seen more clearly the needs of their fellows. The Christian mind should welcome the Atlantic Charter which proclaims 'Freedom from Want' as one of its four main features. Every one who possesses a social conscience must acclaim the ideals expressed also in the Beveridge Scheme as indispensable to the better order of society after the war. The prospect of unemployment, prolonged sickness, widowhood, hangs like the sword of Damocles over the head of the weekly wage-earner. The benefits which Sir William Beveridge's plan will extend to the needy and the suffering will banish at one blow that dread of want incurred in any working family by the uncertainties of life. The plan is eminently Christian because it rests on the central principle of the supreme worth of man and of each individual. The underlying principle is 'Person before property, man before the machine.'

Nothing but good can come of the State's care for its citizens, if it liberates the spirits of men and women from gloomy forebodings for the realization of higher ends. To realize these higher ends is surely the grand object which every State should set before her citizens. Mere material improvement will not necessarily lead to this. But if we are true to the teaching and example of our Lord, our hearts will leap up with joy at the thought that the poor and the unprivileged will enter upon a fuller life, even on the material level.

Our Lord was very deeply concerned with the physical welfare of men and women as well as with their spiritual welfare. How else can one account for His ministry of healing which was just one long battle against all kinds of disease? How else can we explain the compassion which filled His heart whenever He came into contact with hunger, poverty and misfortune? Dr. Oman has pointed out in this connexion that kings and rich men are shadowy figures in Christ's parables: the living figures are the beggar and the debtor. At no time did our Lord imply that it mattered little what happened to man's body, if only his soul were aved. 'It is clear that to have no practical sympathy with the poor was in His opinion the very antithesis of all that was right and good. To sell everything in order to succour them seemed to Jesus no wild or quixotic sacrifice.' Yet, (and this is noteworthy) Christ refused to found His Kingdom upon winning the hearts of the multitude through an abundant supply of the good things of this world; He resolutely declined to become a Bread-King.

I have read somewhere of one David Lubin who had been brought up in the belief that he was a Messiah: and his dream was to become one of the world's benefactors by reducing the price of bread. He had evolved a plan which sounded feasible—each country should report its crop surpluses and deficiencies to a central organization, and on the basis of these statistics 'the Haves' should supply 'the Have-nots.' No people should ever again starve. Unfortunately his conception of bringing the world together on the basis of bread proved too idealistic for complete success in an age of competition. But this apart, good and noble though his plan was, the foundation of international unity and goodwill must be something more spiritual and dynamic than mere outward comfort and prosperity.

Let us make quite sure of this, that even if the Beveridge Scheme is incorporated in the Statute Books of our land, it has not pronounced the last word on social uplift. It has been well said that 'to confuse the Kingdom of man (however beneficent) with the Kingdom of God is to confuse man with God.' Our Lord through His own temptation to take the short cut reminds us that the life is more than the meat, and that man does not live by bread alone but by every word of God.

Moreover, there is no such thing as *absolute* security in a material sense; and the search for it in this very uncertain world is fruitless. Security means literally 'freedom from care'; but no State Insurance can ever issue a policy for that. These days are full of worry and anxiety; death knocks with impartial hand at castle and cottage alike; illness and disease invade the most comfortable homes. There are very decided limits to all schemes for social security. Indeed, there are other kinds of security that matter more. This thought is illustrated in a modern novel, *And now To-morrow* by Rachel Field, in a conversation between Joe Kelly, a mill employee, and Emily Blair, a member of the mill-owning family. Joe says: 'You've always had this thing they call security. You've never known what it was to wonder where your next meal was coming from, or a new pair of shoes or a place to sleep nights.' Emily replies, 'Maybe not, but there are other kinds of security that matter more.'

Now what are these securities that matter more?

To begin with, no insurance scheme can ever evolve a plan for solving *the problems created by personal relationships*. We know full well that personal relationships constitute the supreme problem of the world's life. That problem can never be solved by benefits, however rich and great. Take the relations of employer and employed. If the raising of the unemployment benefit tends to minimize the incentive to work,

[1] Thomas Yates, *A Happy Warrior*, 154.

the Beveridge Plan will become a doubtful blessing: if it makes people simply eager to get rather than to give, it may soon sap the morale of the nation. For money can never be a substitute for character. You can't expect money to bolster up any life when only character can do it. But how are some people to become aware that there is such a problem? How are they to be induced to take up an adult attitude to life in general and become mature in thought and conduct? Is not this the Church's task rather than the State's?

Or take *the problem of living together happily in a home.* It is a profound mistake to imagine that an ample supply of material things is the secret of a happy home. One has known of homes which were running as smoothly as wealth could make them run. But they were only smoothly running houses, *not homes.* The divorce courts of our land supply us with many illustrations of this. No, the 'Pillars of Security' must be broadbased on mutual consideration, respect and love. Ultimately, only the spirit of Christ can bring about such a happy state of affairs. And to gain such a spirit we have to enter a region where State Benefits supply no help or direction because they belong to an entirely different world of values.

Once more, *No national insurance can meet the deep spiritual needs of any one.* It cannot provide him with the Bread of Life from heaven.

> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven.

There is no insurance of a material kind against a broken heart or a guilty conscience. Only Christ can satisfy the hunger of the soul; and he that cometh to Him shall never suffer from spiritual starvation. The hunger of the heart is primarily and essentially hunger for God: for 'God hath put eternity in their heart.'

That is why the message of the gospel finds such a powerful ally in man's breast. The great invitation of Jesus awakens a response within. 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden.' In her *Recollections* Mrs. Humphry Ward tells how on one occasion she remarked to Walter Pater that in her opinion orthodox Christianity could not possibly maintain itself long against its assailants, especially from the historical and literary side, and that they should live to see it break down. She was confident that he would agree with her. But she describes how he shook his head and looked rather troubled. 'I don't think so,' he said. Then with hesitation, 'and we don't altogether agree. You think it's all plain. But I can't. There are such mysterious things. Take that saying, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden." How can you explain that? There is a mystery in it, something supernatural.'

Jesus has revealed to us One whose sovereign purposes of love cannot be baulked or defeated by the lawless violence and hate of men. This love must ever remain our eternal security—the security that matters most. In these anxious and nerve-racking days this is our strength and our stay. ''Tis only in Thee hiding I feel myself secure.' 'He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.'

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Immanence of God.

BY THE REVEREND T. ALEC BURKILL, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., WINSFORD, CHESHIRE.

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'—Ps 139[7].

One of the characteristic features of Old Testament religion is its emphasis on the immanence of the spirit of God. Majestic though He is, Jehovah is never consistently thought of as an absentee God. He is a supernatural Being whose life and purpose stand in an intimate relationship with the historical world of human experience. The divine purpose is worked out in history and consequently the quality of human thought and action is a matter of concern for God. Unlike the Unmoved Mover of Aristotelian philosophy, Jehovah is not a passive spectator of human life who dwells in a transcendent sphere and contemplates all shiftings on the temporal scene with detached indifference. Nor is He merely the goal of man's highest aspirations. He is actively engaged in the actual struggles of human thought and action, and in the last resort His presence is unescapable. It is this truth which finds so beautiful an expression in the Psalm from which our text is taken. The writer is so profoundly conscious of God's immanence that he feels he cannot escape the presence of the Divine Spirit. Should he ascend the high places of the earth, even there amid the quiet loneliness of the mountain tarn God's presence can be felt; should he descend into the depths of the lowest pit, even there God's presence is a reality; or should he (as he himself poetically puts it) 'take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea,' even there the hand of the Lord rests upon him.

Immanence and Abnormality. But like most of the higher achievements of the human spirit, such an experience of God's immanence as that of the Psalmist is not attained in all its wealth of spiritual content without long years of spiritual preparation. And such preparation is always a co-operative enterprise effected by the deeper insights and larger endeavours of outstanding individuals who lead mankind upwards on the path of truth. Thus in the earliest stages of Hebrew religious experience, we find that a naïve distinction was made between normal and abnormal happenings, and God was generally thought of as being present only in those occurrences which exemplified some degree of abnormality. The rising and setting of the sun, for example, are regular events of day-to-day experience, and the primitive mind simply takes them for granted. The same sort of thing can be said of the cycle of the seasons, for every year brings forth the same sequence of spring, summer, autumn and winter. On the other hand, the human mind is from time to time confronted with extraordinary eventualities, such as a mirage in the desert or an unusually intense thunderstorm,

which call for special attention and seem at first sight to require a special explanation. Now the primitive mode of explanation is quite simple: it accounts for the extraordinary by asserting that abnormal things manifest the presence of a supramundane Power which has chosen to enter the regular world of common experience and interfere with its normal operations. Thus according to ancient Old Testament teaching it was the Spirit of God that was responsible for the extraordinary strength of Samson, and it was the same Spirit that inspired Moses to deliver the children of Israel from the Egyptian house of bondage. Ordinary physical strength and ordinary political events were simply taken for granted, but the strength of a Samson and the leadership of a Moses demanded theological explanation.

Gradually, however, it came to be seen that if God is immanent at all in human life and in the world of Nature, He is immanent not merely in abnormal things, but is actively present everywhere and always. It was with supreme spiritual insight that Jesus detected the presence of God in the ordinary things of daily life. For Him the Divine did not fade away in the light of common day, but was veritably reflected by that light. He perceived that the glory of the Heavenly Father shines in the quiet growth of the wild flowers of the field, in the rising and setting of the sun and in the rain which falls on the just and the unjust.

Immanence and Beauty. To a considerable extent through the influence of the poet Wordsworth, we have come to think in modern times of the immanence of God especially in relation to the beauty of Nature. The sentiment in question finds expression in many different kinds of essays, poems and hymns. Wordsworth was brought up amid all the loveliness of the Lake District, and his youthful mind gradually awoke to the realization that all the beautiful things that surrounded him revealed the creative powers and sustaining strength of a Supreme Spirit. The hills and the lakes, the rainbow, the rose and the moon, were for him apparelled in a celestial light and became veritable sacraments of an all-pervading Divine Presence. Thus Wordsworth's poetry has taught us to see something more than the skies, the flowers and the trees—to recognize the creative power of the immanent God whose spirit sustains the whole natural scheme of things.

Immanence and Tragedy. But Jesus went further than Wordsworth, for He recognized the hand of God in life's darkness and ugliness as well as in life's light and beauty. His career was marked at once by sublimity and tragedy. He set out from His Galilean village when still a young man to proclaim a new way of life for mankind. He went forth with all the zest and ardour characteristic of youth. The sun shone in His morning sky, the flowers bloomed at His feet, and the birds sang in the trees around Him. But He was destined soon to meet with bitter disappointment. Through the hardness of men's hearts and through—it seems—the ineluctable forces of circumstance, His hopes and dreams were shattered. Clouds drifted across His sky, the flowers at His feet became thorns, and the song of birds was soon a dirge. So the day of His earthly career quickly darkened into that blackest of all black nights, the night in the Garden of Gethsemane where He drank to the dregs from the cup of life's bitterness. His way was rejected and He was rejected.

Outwardly, therefore, His career ended in defeat, but inwardly it speaks of spiritual triumph through and through. With a transcendency of mind and spirit Christ rose up superior to all the distress and tragedy of His circumstances which seemed to conspire against Him. And what was the secret of Christ's spiritual triumph? The answer is simple yet profound. It was His realization of the immanence of God's sustaining Spirit in all the varied vicissitudes of human experience. This is the faith—the victory that overcomes the world. God is present not merely in the exciting things of life, but in the commonplace things as well; He is present not merely in the golden morning of life when all is fresh and lovely, but also in life's eventide, even when the harvest of tragedy has been gathered in. Perhaps some time when we are confronted with Nature's beautiful scenes we might say this short prayer:

> O Thou who hast given me eyes to see
> And love this sight so fair,
> Give me a heart to find out Thee
> And read Thee everywhere.

The 'Prince of the Covenant' in Daniel xi. 22.

By the Reverend Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., University College of North Wales.

The identification of the 'prince of the covenant' in Dn 11^{22} has from early times provided a problem, to which no agreed solution has been found. At least nine interpretations have been offered, but of these only two survive in modern works. The other seven may be stated and dismissed without discussion, since it is improbable that they would find any advocates to-day. They are:

i. Seleucus Philopator.
ii. Ptolemy Epiphanes.
iii. Demetrius.
iv. Ptolemy Physcon (Euergetes II.).
v. Tryphon.
vi. Judas Maccabaeus.
vii. Antiochus Epiphanes.

In addition we may pass over the view of Kranichfeld and Keil, that the term has no particular individual in mind, but is used of covenant princes in general. This can hardly be said to be an interpretation, but rather despair of finding one.

The remaining two interpretations have found large numbers of followers, who have rejected one another's views with emphasis. The less popular to-day is that the reference is to Ptolemy Philometor. This has been maintained by Calvin, Cornelius à Lapide, Hävernick, Lengerke, Maurer, Stuart, Kliefoth, Reuss, Fabre d'Envieu, and Wright. The other is that Onias III, the ex-High Priest, is intended. This view was first proposed by Theodoret, and in modern times has been followed by Isaac Newton, Rosenmüller, Birks, Hitzig, Rule, Zöckler, Meinhold, Knabenbauer, Bevan, Prince, Driver, Marti, Montgomery, Goettsberger, Charles, Obbink, and Bentzen.

When Heliodorus murdered his master, Seleucus Philopator, the rightful heir to the throne, Demetrius, was a hostage in Rome. The younger brother of the murdered king, Antiochus, hastened from Greece to Syria, and before long had succeeded in eliminating Heliodorus, and in possessing himself of the kingdom. His sister Cleopatra was at this time regent of Egypt for his nephew, Ptolemy Philometor, but on her death the real direction of affairs came into the hands of Eulaeus and Lenaeus, who immediately renewed the Egyptian claim for the return of Coele-Syria to Egypt, and set about war-like preparations to enforce the claim. Antiochus met the Egyptian forces and overwhelmed them, and his nephew Philometor fell into his hands. Then a revolution broke out in Alexandria, and the brother of Philometor, Ptolemy Euergetes, was proclaimed king. Antiochus withdrew from Egypt, leaving it divided against itself. But before long the brothers were reconciled and became joint-rulers. When Antiochus marched against them with an army, however, he was met by the Roman envoy and compelled to withdraw, to his great chagrin.

The view that Ptolemy Philometor was the person referred to in Dn 11^{22}, involves the rendering 'a confederate prince,' or the like. Against this there is no difficulty, and the absence of the article in נְגִיד בְּרִית is held to favour this rendering, rather than 'the prince of the covenant.' The word בְּרִית is used of a treaty elsewhere, and might well have that meaning here. To establish that Antiochus was confederate with Philometor, however, is not so easy. Antiochus the Great had entered into a treaty with Egypt at the time of Cleopatra's marriage, and one of the terms may have been that Coele-Syria should be her marriage portion.[1] It would perhaps not be unnatural that Antiochus should resist a claim for the implementing of this clause after the death of Cleopatra, when it had not been pressed by Cleopatra herself during her regency. But it would in any case be a strange choice of words to call Philometor נְגִיד בְּרִית, and especially in this chapter where he would be expected to appear as the king of the South. Moreover, on this view *v.*[22] merely anticipates *vv.* [23-25], for in *v.*[25] we read of the great army the king of the South should raise, and of its defeat. Nor would it be expected that Philometor should be referred to as broken in pieces, since despite the great victory of Antiochus, the ultimate issue was his withdrawal in shame from Egypt, and the restoration to power of Philometor and his brother. The only natural reading of the passage must find in it the reference to someone who was completely destroyed, and that before the war with Egypt had appeared on the horizon.

The other view, that Onias is the prince of the covenant, has quite other difficulties. Onias was the High Priest until displaced by Jason in 175 B.C. Later Jason was replaced by Menelaus, at whose instigation Onias was murdered in 171 B.C., although he had taken sanctuary in the shrine of Apollo at Daphne.[2] In favour of the view that the murder of Onias is referred to in Dn 11^{22}, it is argued that elsewhere in the Book of Daniel בְּרִית always refers to the Jewish religion. Certainly it is in its favour, as against the preceding view, that Onias was murdered, and thus completely eliminated. Against it, however, is the consideration that Antiochus can hardly be held responsible for the murder. In a Jewish source, which is not marked by any love for Antiochus, we are told that Antiochus wept when he heard of the murder, and ordered the murderer to be executed on the very spot where he committed his crime.[3] Further, this incident can have no relevance in the context of Dn 11^{22}, for it was in no way associated with any triumph of Antiochus that involved the sweeping of his adversaries before him.

It would seem, therefore, that none of the views so far proposed is satisfactory, and a fresh effort at identification is called for. There is one candi-

[1] Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, 306, says her dowry was the taxes of Coele-Syria and Palestine, but this by no means implies the cession of the disputed provinces. Bevan (*History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 271) finds it impossible to establish more than that Coele-Syria came into the negotiations somehow, since Alexandria later claimed that Antiochus had agreed to its retrocession, but he adds that 'if it was debatable to people who had all the documents before them, it is not much use for modern scholars, without the documents, to make guesses in the dark.'

[2] Cf. 2 Macc 4. [3] 2 Macc $4^{37f.}$

date who does not seem yet to have been suggested, but who would seem to fit all the conditions. This is the young son of Seleucus Philopator, also named Antiochus, like his uncle. On the murder of Seleucus, it would appear that Heliodorus proclaimed this child king, and hoped to rule in his name. Antiochus Epiphanes, who is commonly called Antiochus IV., but who should really be Antiochus V., assumed the throne jointly with his nephew at first, but before long eliminated him in some unrecorded way, so that he has left scant trace in the records.[1] His elimination exactly fits the point in the narrative reached in *v.*[22]. The previous verse records that Antiochus Epiphanes was not the rightful heir to the throne. He is said to have come to obtain the kingdom by flatteries, and it was doubtless due to his address that he succeeded in collecting the force with which he secured the kingdom. *V.*[22] then refers to the complete overthrow of all who opposed his assumption of the power,[2] and it would be fitting to append to this a reference to the elimination of his nephew, which quickly followed, and which preceded the events dealt with in *vv.*[23-25]. For this elimination Antiochus was responsible, and it served his purpose, and unlike the defeat of Ptolemy Philometor it was final.

There would appear to be a difficulty, however, in applying the term נְגִיד בְּרִית to this child. We have no knowledge of any league or treaty binding his uncle to him, though the phrase would as well cover one who was for a brief period associated with Antiochus on the throne as it would Philometor. It is possible, however, that it has a somewhat different meaning, more completely relevant to the child Antiochus.

Bevan, who interprets the verse of Onias, adduces the meaning of the Syriac ܩܝܡܐ to support his case.[3] While this does not seem really to support it, Bevan has pointed the way to a more satisfactory view. He observes that in Syriac ܩܝܡܐ = *covenant* is used for *the clergy*. 'The prince of the clergy' might seem, in the light of this, to be a suitable term for the High Priest. Against this, however, it is to be noted that the fact that in Christian Syriac ܩܝܡܐ had the meaning of *the clergy* is no evidence whatever that it was used of the Jewish priesthood some centuries earlier. Moreover, even in Christian Syriac ܩܝܡܐ appears to mean the *minor clergy*, or *members of religious orders*,[4] and they can be distinguished from the ܟܠܝܪܘܣ = κλῆρος.[5] The term would thus be less appropriate for the High Priest than is suggested.

It may, however, be noted that the Syriac ܩܝܡܐ not only corresponds to the Hebrew בְּרִית = *covenant*, but also to the Hebrew חֹק = *statute*. If the word בְּרִית were here understood in the sense of the Syriac ܩܝܡܐ, therefore, it would yield the meaning 'lawful prince,' or 'rightful prince.' This meaning is found in the Peshiṭta Old Testament, where ܒܥܠܬ ܩܝܡܐ = *lawful wife*.[6] Moreover, this is an authenticated meaning in Jewish Aramaic, and the sense *statute* for קְיָמָא is actually found in the Aramaic part of the Book of Daniel in 6[8. 16]. In the Targum of Onkelos איתת קימא = *lawful wife*,[7] and גבר קימא = *lawful husband*.[8] If, then, the meaning of קְיָמָא, ܩܝܡܐ is appealed to, it would seem better to appeal to a known contemporary usage, than to a later Christian usage, which is quite different in itself from that which it is used to justify here, and irrelevant to the passage anyway, since, as has been said above, there is independent reason to reject any reference to the High Priest here. On the other hand, the meaning *rightful prince* precisely fits the child Antiochus.

It may be asked if the title *rightful prince* would not better suit Demetrius, whose claims were upheld by Grotius. It is true that Demetrius was an elder brother of the child Antiochus, with a better title to the throne, and it is probable that the author of the Book of Daniel elsewhere indi-

[1] Cf. Bevan, *House of Seleucus*, ii. 126, and *Cambridge Ancient History*, viii. 497 f., 713 f. That Antiochus Epiphanes was responsible for the death of this child is stated in a fragment of John of Antioch's (cf. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum græcorum*, iv. 558—No. 58). The present writer has argued (*Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (1935), 111), that this child was one of the uprooted horns referred to in Dn 7[8].

[2] Cf. Driver, *op. cit.* 182: 'The reference (in verse 22a) is ambiguous: it might of course be to the forces of Ptolemy Philometor; but more probably the domestic or other enemies who opposed Antiochus' rise to power are meant.'

[3] *Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1892), 187.

[4] Cf. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, ii (1901) col. 3534.

[5] Cf. W. Wright, *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite* (1882), 32, 1, 4: ܟܠܗ ܟܠܝܪܘܣ ܘܟܠ ܟܠܗ ܕܝܪ̈ܬܐ ܕܢܝܚ̈ܐ ܕܒ̈ܢܝ ܩܝܡܐ = *all his clergy and all the members of religious orders, both men and women*. The fact that the ܩܝܡܐ included women sufficiently indicates that *clergy* is a misleading rendering. The expression 'chief of the ܩܝܡܐ' could not therefore be used appropriately to describe a metropolitan; much less can we deduce a Jewish meaning of 'high priest.'

[6] Dt 13[6] (M.T. 7), 28[54]. In both of these passages the Syriac renders חֵק, instead of the Massoretic חֵיק = *bosom*.

[7] Dt 13[7], 28[54]—again rendering חֵק for חֵיק.

[8] Dt 28[56]—where once more M.T. has חֵיק.

cates his view that Demetrius, the child Antiochus, and Ptolemy Philometor, all had better claims to the throne than Antiochus Epiphanes. But while Demetrius's claim to the throne was passed over, and the author of the Book of Daniel could not know that he would yet live to sit on the throne, he could less appropriately be spoken of as broken to pieces than the child who was done away with. Moreover, since no article is used, the text does not imply that the reference is necessarily to 'the lawful prince,' but merely to 'a lawful prince,' *i.e.* to one who had a better title to the throne than the upstart Antiochus Epiphanes.

One further difficulty remains. How can the meaning of the Aramaic word קִימָא, סְמִכֵן be appealed to, to give the meaning of the Hebrew בְּרִית here, since the latter does not elsewhere have this meaning? It must be remembered that the Book of Daniel has come to us in a bilingual form, and some have held that it was originally written all in Aramaic, and the beginning and end were then turned into Hebrew.[1] A number of mistranslations have been alleged, and it would occasion no difficulty on that view if there were here an additional mistranslation, one of the equivalents of קִימָא being used when another was really required. On the present writer's view, the Book of Daniel was bilingual from the beginning, but the author was much more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew.[2] It would occasion no surprise, then, if his Hebrew came out flavoured with Aramaic idioms. To one who has worked in a bilingual country, many of whose students use Welsh with greater fluency than English, and then often English coloured with Welsh idioms, no difficulty in the process suggested remains.

The view proposed therefore accords with the historical data, and involves no more than an Aramaism in the use of the normal Hebrew equivalent of קִימָא. It requires no interference with the logical or chronological sequence of the events in these verses, and offers a solution which is strictly relevant at the precise point where it stands. Of none of the views hitherto advanced can this be said.

[1] So Marti and Charles; also Zimmermann, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lvii. (1938) 255 ff., lviii. (1939) 349 ff.

[2] Cf. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. ix. (1932) 256 ff.

Entre Nous.

School Prayers.

Miss J. M. MacDougall Ferguson, who holds the Selly Oak Colleges Diploma in Religious Education, has compiled a very interesting book of services of worship for schools which she calls *The School Assembly* (Religious Education Press; 6s. net). The book is the result of hard work and a fine taste in literature and exhibits a good knowledge of what is suitable for the mind of youth. As Dr. Basil Yeaxlee says in a Foreword, we cannot have too many of such experiments, even though none of them is by any means perfect and some of them are decidedly imperfect.

Miss Ferguson holds the view that forms of worship that are merely dignified and devout do not satisfy the adolescent spirit. And 'of set purpose,' she adds, 'liturgical services and those following the Church's Year have been avoided.' But, apart from the fact that her own services are pure liturgy, and delightfully so, I think her outlook on this matter is mistaken. And I am glad that she has not followed out her idea. For the child is an inveterate ritualist. It is agony to him to depart a hairbreadth from 'what is done,' and the adolescent is in this matter no different from the child. On the same line of thought she says that almost all the great classical prayers are beyond the spiritual comprehension of the 'teen-age boy and girl.' I venture again to differ. In my judgment many of the great classical prayers are simple and so general that every age can find itself in them. The same is true of the great hymns. I think it is the classical hymns that should find a place in child worship and not 'I'm a little pilgrim,' and such like. I would almost lay it down as a good rule to avoid 'children's hymns'—almost, but not quite. In this regard Miss Ferguson, I am glad to say, is above criticism.

The scheme of the services here is both original and satisfying. First the theme is clearly stated in a call to worship. It is then uttered in an Introit. Then we have a Bible reading, followed by a prose or poetry reading echoing the theme; then a hymn, a prayer and finally what the author sometimes calls a Benediction. The selections from literature are for the most part very happy, and not the least hackneyed. (See the short quotation from Seaver's *Edward Wilson of the Antarctic*, which I quote.) They are one of the most valuable parts of the book and I have marked about a dozen that I want to keep for pleasure and use. Towards the end of the book there is a section of Litanies that are so supremely good and so supremely liturgical that one wonders what the author's repudiation of liturgical services means.

I ought to say that the themes of these services are arranged under the following headings—God: The Father, God: The Son, God: The Holy Spirit, Joy and Praise, Privilege and Responsibility, Times and Seasons (the Christian Year is all here), Litanies and Services, and in an exceedingly useful addendum a selection of the great classical prayers. I would like to say how much I admire the fine

spirit in these devotions and the freshness of mind that devised them. They will, I hope, enrich the worship of many schools. F. J. RAE.

Edinburgh.

Peace-making.

'Once he [Edward Wilson of the Antarctic] wrote to his wife thus: "I want to tell you what an immense help that little remark of your father's has been to me. You told me your father had said I was a peace-maker. What made him think so I can't guess, but I determined I would try to be one, for I had never thought about the matter before; and indeed a little bit of peace-making is wanted here and there in this community of men, some of whom are not inclined to live peaceably with one another. . . . Your father's remark has helped me to do something at any rate to smooth things over sometimes."

'The secret of Wilson's influence lay in a self-discipline that was as habitual as most men's habits are, an inner culture of mind and heart and will that gave his life a poise, so that he could not be untrue either to himself or to his fellow-men.'

The Gobi Desert.

In *The Gobi Desert*, by Mildred Cable and Francesca French, we have a book of travel that exercises the strongest fascination. After they had lived for more than twenty years in the Province of Shansi in North China, Miss Cable with her two missionary companions, Eva and Francesca French, trekked past the barrier of the Great Wall. For years they travelled up and down over the Gobi Desert until they became part of its life. What a country it is—a place of desolation, of sand, winter blizzards, bare rocks, and small oases communities, each with their own particular civilization. And what a mixture of races they met—Chinese, Turki, Arabic, Mongolian, Tibetan, Quazaq, and Russian. Through their eyes we see all the scenes vividly and get to know the life as they knew it. And alas, the only way now that we can know the old Gobi civilization is by the help of Miss Cable, for a new era has dawned in the desert. The invasion by Japan of China brought the opening up of the old mule tracks, and now lorries of ammunition thunder along them; the primitive inns are disappearing, and many of the oases are being abandoned.

In the last chapter the authors meditate on the lessons that the Gobi has taught them. 'We had heard a call, we had visualized those Central Asian trade-routes with their cities, villages and hamlets, we knew that some Christian women must go to the people who lived in them, and we were glad to be the women chosen for the job.

'Far from being impoverished by the sacrifice, we now realized something of the wealth which had been added to life, and the enrichment of thought and experience which had come through all the inevitable detachments, as well as by the contacts and incidents of the way.'

The Narrow Way.

'Released from a whole round of trivial activities which were an inevitable part of normal life, I immediately came into a new environment. . . . My course would now lie over a sea of sand, and as the seafaring man stands at the prow of his vessel and looks across the trackless waste of waters, so I stood on a small desert eminence and looked over the boundless plain.

'My first feeling had been a sense of liberation which was intoxicating. I threw up my arms as if to take flight, saying: "I have the freedom of the spaces and I can go anywhere"; but even as I looked, my eye caught the faint trace of a scarcely perceptible line leading across the waste and I realized that this was the desert foot-track, a path trodden out through the ages by countless wayfarers. The dust-storm might cover it over for a time, but its ancient foundation would slowly and surely re-emerge. As I looked at the path I became conscious that never before had my feet been held to so narrow a way.' [1]

Walking in Darkness.

'My guide also taught me another lesson, and that was how to walk by starlight. At first I stumbled and hurt my feet among the stones, but I saw that he walked as quickly, as securely, and as freely by night as by day. Then I realized that he had used his daylight powers of sense to train the more subtle instinct which served him in the dark, and gradually I too learnt the art of training and then trusting my instincts until I also felt secure in the clear darkness, which is the only darkness that the desert knows. I remembered a wise word spoken by an old prophet concerning a man who was faithful and obedient yet who walked in darkness and had no light. Surely, like the desert wayfarer who walks securely by starlight, that man had learnt obedience and quick response in days of normal experience, and when dark hours came he walked confidently, his heart stayed upon God and relying on the certainties which he had proved in the hour of clear vision.' [2]

In 'The Week's Book Causerie' in *The Methodist Recorder* for 2nd September, attention is drawn to a small book of verse, written by a missionary, and published by the Methodist Press at Suva, Fiji. The following is quoted from it.

One God, immortal, invisible
And incomprehensible.
Immortal,
Yet alive in this humanity:
Invisible,
Yet seen in every tree:
Incomprehensible,
Yet known in Calvary.

[1] Mildred Cable and Francesca French, *The Gobi Desert*, 288.
[2] *Ib.* 290.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.